arXiv:1605.04766v2 [math.PR] 27 May 2016

Exceptional times for percolation under exclusion dynamics

Christophe Garban* Hugo Vanneuville*

Abstract

We analyse in this paper a conservative analogue of the celebrated model of **dynamical percolation** introduced by Häggström, Peres and Steif in [HPS97]. It is simply defined as follows: start with an initial percolation configuration $\omega(t=0)$. Let this configuration evolve in time according to a simple exclusion process with symmetric kernel $K(x,y)$. We start with a general investigation (following [HPS97]) of this dynamical process $t \mapsto \omega_K(t)$ which we call ***K*-exclusion dynamical percolation**. We then proceed with a detailed analysis of the planar case at the critical point (both for the triangular grid and the square lattice $\mathbb{Z}^2$) where we consider the power-law kernels K^α

$$K^\alpha(x,y) \propto \frac{1}{\|x-y\|_2^{2+\alpha}}\,.$$

We prove that if $\alpha > 0$ is chosen small enough, there exist **exceptional times** t for which an infinite cluster appears in $\omega_{K^\alpha}(t)$. (On the triangular grid, we prove that it holds for all $\alpha < \alpha_0 = \frac{217}{816}$.) The existence of such exceptional times for standard i.i.d. dynamical percolation (where sites evolve according to independent Poisson point processes) goes back to the work by Schramm-Steif in [SS10]. In order to handle such a K-exclusion dynamics, we push further the spectral analysis of **exclusion noise sensitivity** which had been initiated in [BGS13]. (The latter paper can be viewed as a conservative analogue of the seminal paper by Benjamini-Kalai-Schramm [BKS99] on i.i.d. noise sensitivity.) The case of a nearest-neighbour simple exclusion process, corresponding to the limiting case $\alpha = +\infty$, is left widely open.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
1.1 Dynamical percolation 2
1.2 Percolation under exclusion dynamics 3
1.3 Main results 4

2 Background and outline of proof **7**
2.1 Arm events and some other notations 7
2.2 Second moment method and exclusion sensitivity 8
2.3 The spectral sample in the i.i.d. setting 10
2.4 Spectral representation of correlations in the conservative case 11
2.5 Outline of proof and new spectral estimates 12

3 Warm-up without spectral analysis: proofs of Propositions 1.3 and 1.4 **16**

4 Exceptional times at criticality: proofs of Theorem 1.5 and Proposition 1.6 **19**

*Université Lyon 1. Supported by the ANR grant "Liouville" ANR-15-CE40-0013

5 Clustering effect for the spectral sample **25**
5.1 A very small spectral sample not localized in the neighbourhood of the origin 25
5.2 A spectral sample with a little part not localized in the neighbourhood of the origin 25

6 Open questions **37**

A Appendix: graphical construction (à la Harris) of Exclusion dynamics **38**

B Appendix: a general property about the spectral sample **38**

C Appendix: the 4-arm event conditioned on a half-plane **40**

Bibliography **43**

1 Introduction

1.1 Dynamical percolation

We consider bond percolation on an infinite transitive locally finite graph $G = (V, E)$. We write $\mathbb{P}_p$ for the probability measure of (bond) **percolation of parameter p** on G i.e. the probability measure on $\Omega = \{-1, 1\}^E$ obtained by declaring each edge **open** with probability p and **closed** with probability $1-p$ independently of the others (1 means open and -1 means closed). More formally, $\mathbb{P}_p$ is the product measure $(p\delta_1 + (1-p)\delta_{-1})^{\otimes E}$ on Ω equipped with the product σ-algebra. An element $\omega \in \Omega$ is called a **percolation configuration**. Moreover, we call **cluster** a connected component of the graph obtained by keeping only the open edges. It is a simple consequence of Kolmogorov 0-1 law that for each p, $\mathbb{P}_p[\exists \text{ an infinite cluster}] \in \{0, 1\}$. Moreover, it is well known (see for instance [Gri99] or [BR06]) that there exists a **critical point** $p_c = p_c(G) \in [0, 1]$ such that:

$$\forall p \in [0, p_c),\ \mathbb{P}_p[\exists \text{ an infinite cluster}] = 0\,,$$
$$\forall p \in (p_c, 1],\ \mathbb{P}_p[\exists \text{ an infinite cluster}] = 1\,.$$

The most studied model is bond percolation on the cubic lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$, $d \geq 2$. For this model, it is known that $p_c = p_c(d) \in (0, 1)$. In other words, there exists a phase transition. Moreover, it is a celebrated theorem by Kesten [Kes80] that $p_c(2) = 1/2$ and it is conjectured that, for any $d \geq 2$, $\mathbb{P}_{p_c}[\exists \text{ an infinite cluster}] = 0$. This last property has been proved for $d = 2$ ([Har60]) and $d \geq 11$ (see [HS94, FvdH15]).

In [HPS97], Häggström, Peres and Steif define and study the model of **dynamical** (bond) **percolation** (this model has also been invented independently by Benjamini). Dynamical percolation of parameter $p \in [0, 1]$ is defined very easily as follows: we sample a percolation configuration $\omega(0)$ according to some initial law and we then let evolve each edge independently of each other according to Poisson point processes : at rate one, the states of edges are resampled using $p\delta_1 + (1-p)\delta_{-1}$. We obtain this way a càdlàg Markov process $(\omega(t))_{t\geq 0}$ on the space Ω (seen as the compact metric product space) with (unique) invariant probability measure $\mathbb{P}_p$. The main question is whether, if $\omega(0) \sim \mathbb{P}_p$, there exist **exceptional times** for which the percolation configuration is very atypical. Exceptional times are defined as follows: if $\mathbb{P}_p[\exists \text{ an infinite cluster}] = 0$, then an exceptional time is a time for which there is an infinite cluster. On the other hand, if $\mathbb{P}_p[\exists \text{ an infinite cluster}] = 1$, then it is a time for which there is no infinite cluster.

From now on, we assume that $\omega(0) \sim \mathbb{P}_p$. Since $\mathbb{P}_p$ is an invariant measure, then (by Fubini) a.s. Leb-*a.e.* there is no exceptional time (where Leb is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$). This observation does not imply that a.s. there does not exist any exceptional time. However, it is the case outside of the critical point: the authors of [HPS97] have proved that, for any graph G, if $p \neq p_c$ then a.s. there is no exceptional time (see their Proposition 1.1).

The case $p = p_c$ is in general much more difficult. First, let us note that, for bond percolation on the cubic lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$, it is for the moment interesting only for $d = 2$ and $d \geq 11$ since these are the only dimensions for which we know what happens at criticality. For $d \geq 11$, thanks to a result proved in [HS94] for $d \geq 19$ (and extended very recently to $d \geq 11$ in [FvdH15]), the authors of [HPS97] have proved that even at criticality a.s. there is no exceptional time (see their Theorem 1.3). However, for $d = 2$, the following is proved in [GPS10] (Theorem 1.4):

For dynamical bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$, a.s. there are exceptional times if $p = p_c = 1/2$.

Such a result had been proved earlier in [SS10] for the model of **site percolation on the triangular lattice**. Let $\mathbb{T}$ denote the (planar) triangular lattice and let $\mathbb{P}_p$ denote the probability measure of site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$ (this is the analogous model where the sites - i.e. the vertices of $\mathbb{T}$ - are open or closed; in this context a cluster is a connected component of the graph obtained by keeping only the open sites). Kesten's work also implies that $p_c = 1/2$ for this model. Of course, one can define dynamical site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$ in the same way as for dynamical bond percolation i.e. by associating exponential clocks to the sites of $\mathbb{T}$. The reason to consider site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$ is due to the fact that much more is known for this model than for bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Indeed conformal invariance (as the mesh goes to zero) has been proved by Smirnov in [Smi01], and the exact value of several critical exponents (see Subsection 2.1) has been derived in [LSW02, SW01] using the **Schramm Loewner Evolution (SLE)** processes introduced by Schramm. Using the knowledge of these critical exponents, the following is proved in [SS10] (Theorem 1.3):

For dynamical site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$, a.s. there are exceptional times if $p = p_c = 1/2$.

Finally, let us mention that in [GPS10] it is shown that, for critical site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$, the Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptional times is a.s. $31/36$. For other results, see for instance [HPS15] where the authors show that typical exceptional times are intimately related to the so-called Incipient Infinite Cluster introduced by Kesten.

In both [SS10] and [GPS10], the main methods are related to the theory of **Fourier decomposition of Boolean functions**. In the present paper, we will also rely extensively on such tools, see Subsections 2.3 and 2.4.

1.2 Percolation under exclusion dynamics

What we study in this paper is the same question of existence of exceptional times but with a different underlying dynamical process: we will now let the configuration evolve according to a **symmetric exclusion process**. Percolation evolving according to an exclusion process has already been studied by Broman, the first author and Steif in [BGS13] where the authors introduce and study the notion of **exclusion sensitivity**. (We will say more about this notion in Section 2, see also [For15a, For15b].) To define and study a symmetric exclusion process (which is a Feller Markov process), the most efficient way is to rely on its infinitesimal generator, see [Lig05]. However, we will sometimes need to rely on a more explicit construction of this dynamics, usually called a **graphical construction** after [Har78]. We provide such a construction in Appendix A.

Definition 1.1. Take K a symmetric transition matrix on the set of edges E (a similar definition holds for dynamics on the sites). Sample a percolation configuration $\omega_K(0)$ according to some probability law. To each pair of edges $\{e, f\}$, associate an exponential clock of parameter $K(e, f) = K(f, e)$ independent of the others and $\omega_K(0)$. When the clock of a pair $\{e, f\}$ rings, exchange the states of the two edges. This way, we obtain a càdlàg Markov process $(\omega_K(t))_{t\geq 0}$ on the space Ω that is called a K-(symmetric) exclusion process. For every $p \in [0, 1]$, $\mathbb{P}_p$ is an invariant measure. In the following, we will always consider the case $\omega_K(0) \sim \mathbb{P}_p$ for some $p \in [0, 1]$ and will call the corresponding process a ***K*-exclusion dynamical percolation of parameter *p***. (See Appendix A for a graphical construction of this particle system.)

For more clarity, we call the dynamical percolation process of [HPS97] (defined in Subsection 1.1) **i.i.d. dynamical percolation** (indeed, in this last process, the states of the edges evolve independently of each other and according to the same law).

Following [BGS13], our main motivation in this paper is guided by the following observation. For an exclusion process of parameter p which starts at equilibrium, one has $\omega_K(t) \sim \mathbb{P}_p$ for all $t \geq 0$. As such, one may ask the same natural questions as for the i.i.d. dynamical process. In particular, we define exceptional times exactly in the same way. We shall consider in this article the following families of symmetric transition kernels K.

Definition 1.2 (Symmetric transition kernels K considered in this work)**.**

1. First, we shall analyse what happens away from the critical point $p_c = p_c(G)$ for any graph G and at p_c for percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with $d \geq 11$ (see Propositions 1.3 and 1.4). The proofs in these cases are very close to the i.i.d. setting and work for **any** symmetric kernel K.
2. Then, we focus on what happens at the critical point in the planar setting (critical bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ or critical site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$). The most natural and most studied conservative dynamics in this case is certainly the **nearest-neighbour simple exclusion process** which on the triangular lattice $\mathbb{T}$ corresponds to the following kernel:
$$K(v,w) := \frac{1}{6}\mathbb{1}_{v\sim w}\,.$$
(For bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$, one may consider several natural versions of nearest-neigbour exclusion process acting on edges.) As we shall explain later, we are far from being able to prove the existence of exceptional times (even on the triangular lattice $\mathbb{T}$) for this classical dynamics. This is why we consider the following kernels which in some sense interpolate between the i.i.d. case and the nearest-neighbour dynamics.
3. The main class of dynamics that we will analyse are the following **power-law kernels**. For any $\alpha \in (0, +\infty)$, let
$$\begin{cases} K^\alpha(v,v) & := 0 \\ K^\alpha(v,w) & := c_\alpha \frac{1}{\|v-w\|_2^{2+\alpha}} \text{ if } v \neq w\,, \end{cases}$$
where c_α is a normalization factor so that K^α is a transition kernel (i.e. $\sum_w K^\alpha(v,w) = 1$). For bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$, one measures the Euclidean distance between two edges as the distance between their mid-points. The shape of the decay (in $r^{-(2+\alpha)}$) is chosen here in such a way that particles move at large scales according to ***α*-stable** processes. Note that by letting $\alpha \searrow 0$, one recovers in some sense an i.i.d. dynamics, while $\alpha \to +\infty$ converges to the nearest-neighbour simple exclusion process.
4. Finally, the last family of kernels that we shall investigate are the following ones which are designed to be **super-heavy-tailed** (or in other words, they induce a very long-range exclusion process). The reason to consider these long-range dynamics is that the spectral analysis will be much simpler in this case than for the power-law kernels K^α. Consider for any $a \in (0, +\infty)$,
$$\begin{cases} K^a_{\log}(v,v) & := 0 \\ K^a_{\log}(v,w) & := c_a \frac{1}{\|v-w\|_2^2 \log(\|v-w\|_2+1)^{1+a}} \text{ if } v \neq w\,. \end{cases}$$

We now list the main results proved in this paper.

1.3 Main results

Our first two results are the direct analogues for exlcusion dynamics of the main results on i.i.d. dynamics proved in the seminal paper on dynamical percolation [HPS97]. The proofs follow very closely the ideas from [HPS97] and do not require any assumption on the symmetric kernel K.

Proposition 1.3. *For any graph G and any symmetric transition matrix K on the edges of G, if $p \neq p_c$ then a.s. there is no exceptional time for the K-exclusion process of parameter p. (This result is also true for site percolation and the proof is the same.)*

Proposition 1.4. *Let $d \geq 11$.[1] Then, for any symmetric transition matrix K on the edges of the cubic lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$, a.s. there is no exceptional time for the K-exclusion process of parameter p even if $p = p_c = p_c(d)$.*

Let us now state the main theorem of this paper (which answers a question that motivated [BGS13]).

Theorem 1.5. *Let K^α be the transition matrix from Definition 1.2 on the edges of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ or on the sites of $\mathbb{T}$. If $\alpha > 0$ is sufficiently small, then a.s. there exist exceptional times for the K^α-exclusion dynamical percolation of parameter $p = p_c = 1/2$.*

Moreover, in the case of dynamics on the sites of $\mathbb{T}$, one has the following explicit lower-bound (as a function of α) on the Hausdorff dimension of exceptional times. Let

$$d(\alpha) := 1 - \frac{5}{36}\left(1 - \frac{68}{21}\alpha\right)^{-1}.$$

*The Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptional times of a K^α-exclusion process of parameter $p_c = 1/2$ is an a.s. constant that lies in $[d(\alpha), 31/36]$. See Figure 1 for a plot of this estimate. In particular, we see that we obtain the existence of exceptional times for any $\alpha < \alpha_0 = 217/816$.[2] Note also that our lower-bound $d(\alpha)$ converges to $31/36$ as $\alpha \searrow 0$, which is known to be the Hausdorff dimension of exceptional times for the **i.i.d. dynamical percolation** ([GPS10]).*



Figure 1: The red curve represents the lower-bound $\alpha \mapsto d(\alpha)$ we obtain in Theorem 1.5 on the Hausdorff dimension of exceptional times for the power law kernels $K^\alpha(x, y) \propto \|x - y\|^{-(2+\alpha)}$. As we see from this plot, we obtain in particular the existence of exceptional times for all $\alpha < \alpha_0 = 217/816 \approx 0.266$. The blue curve on the top is the (much easier) upper-bound equal to $31/36$. We conjecture that the dimension is a.s. equal to this value of $31/36$ for any $\alpha \in (0, +\infty]$ where "$\alpha = +\infty$" would be the nearest-neighbour case.

[1] This estimate $d \geq 11$ follows from the recent strengthening [FvdH15] of [HS94] which would have given $d \geq 19$ instead.

[2] The proof we will need for $\mathbb{Z}^2$ implies that one can go in fact slightly above this threshold α_0. See the upper-bound given by (4.10).

Theorem 1.5 will be proved in Section 4 (thanks to a result about a clustering effect for spectral sets of percolation whose proof will be postponed to Section 5). Let us say that, as it can be seen in the statement of Theorem 1.5, for our proof to work, our dynamics should not be too localized (indeed, the larger α is, the more localized the exclusion dynamics is). With this in mind, it is not surprising that the proof is simpler (and gives a more precise estimate about the Hausdorff dimension) if we let $K = K^a_{\log}$ be the **long-range** symmetric transition matrix introduced in Definition 1.2 (defined on the edges of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ or on the sites of $\mathbb{T}$).

Proposition 1.6. *Take any $a > 0$. Then a.s. there exist exceptional times for the $K^a_{\log}$-exclusion dynamical percolation of parameter $p = p_c = 1/2$. Moreover, in the case of dynamics on the sites of $\mathbb{T}$, a.s. the Hausdorff dimension of this set of times equals* $31/36$.

The most studied model of exclusion process is the nearest-neighbour process (see item 2 in Definition 1.2). As mentioned above, our proof does not work for very localized dynamics. So, for us, this last process is the most difficult to deal with. Still we conjecture:

Conjecture 1.7. *Take K any symmetric transition matrix on the edges of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ or on the sites of $\mathbb{T}$. We assume that K equals 0 on the diagonal. Then a.s. there are exceptional times for the K-exclusion dynamical percolation of parameter $p = p_c = 1/2$. Moreover, a.s. the Hausdorff dimension of this set of times equals* $31/36$.

Remark 1.8. One can note that the above conjecture suggests that we think that things occur in the same way in the i.i.d. exclusion process as in any symmetric exclusion process. The problem to argue that Conjecture 1.7 is indeed true is that our proofs of Theorem 1.5 and Proposition 1.6 really rely on the "not localized" properties of the chosen dynamics. However, we have other clues to say that in some sense any symmetric exclusion process "looks like the i.i.d. process". That is actually the purpose of an ongoing work where we plan to prove that in some sense for any symmetric and translation invariant kernel K on the sites of $\mathbb{T}$ (that equals 0 on the diagonal), the K-exclusion dynamical percolation of parameter $p_c = 1/2$ has a limit in the continuum that (if we change the time by only a constant factor) is the same as the limit of the i.i.d. process (this last limit has been proved to exist and studied in [GPS13a] and [GPS13b]). That would in particular imply that, for any such K, "Conjecture 1.7 is true in the continuum".

To conclude this section on main results, let us stress that another important contribution of this paper is a strengthening of some of the spectral estimates on the Fourier spectrum of critical percolation obtained in [GPS10]. It would be too early at this stage to state these results, but Theorem 2.8 will be an example of this.

Organization of the paper. The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we provide an outline of the proof of our main result Theorem 1.5. In particular, we discuss clustering effects for the spectral sets of percolation. Next, Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Propositions 1.3 and 1.4. In this section we do not use any spectral analysis tool and we follow the seminal paper [HPS97]. Then, in Sections 4 and 5, we focus on the planar case at the critical point. Our main goal is to prove Theorem 1.5. As explained at the end of Subsection 2.5, there are two steps in the proof of this last theorem: *(a)* showing a result about a clustering effect for spectral sets of percolation. The proof of this last result - in the spirit of [GPS10] - is written in Section 5. *(b)* Showing that this clustering effect implies a singularity property for the spectral sets of percolation when we let them evolve under our exclusion dynamics. This last step is the subject of Section 4.

Acknowledgments:
We wish to thank Cédric Bernardin for useful discussions on exclusion processes and duality formulas as well as Jeff Steif for pointing to us very useful references.

2 Background and outline of proof

2.1 Arm events and some other notations

In this subsection, we list some classical notations/inequalities on (static) critical percolation. We refer for example to [GPS10, Wer07] for more background.

We will focus from now on (except in Section 3) on two models: bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$. In both cases, we think about percolation configurations $\omega \in \Omega$ as colourings of the plane, see Subsection 2.1 of [GPS10] for more details. If ω is a percolation configuration, we write $0 \overset{\omega}{\longleftrightarrow} R$ (or sometimes simply $0 \leftrightarrow R$) if there exists an open path from 0 to $\partial[-R,R]^2$ in ω.

The **tile** of a site/edge will denote the region of the plane whose colour is determined by this site/edge (again, see Subsection 2.1 of [GPS10] for more precise definitions). For any $R \geq 0$, in the context of site percolation of $\mathbb{T}$, $\mathcal{I}_R$ will denote the finite subset of the plane that consists of the sites whose tile intersects $[-R,R]^2$. In the context of bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$, it will denote the finite subset of the plane that consists of the midpoints of the edges whose tile intersects $[-R,R]^2$ (we choose the midpoints only to obtain a discrete set). With these notations, we can define $\Omega_R := \{-1,1\}^{\mathcal{I}_R}$. In other words, it is the set of percolation configurations restricted to the window $[-R,R]^2$. We also write $\mathcal{I} = \cup_R \mathcal{I}_R$. We will say that two disjoint subsets of the plane are **percolation disjoint** if there is no tile intersecting the two subsets.

An important notion is the notion of ***k*-arm event**. First, we call square annulus an annulus of the form $\left(x+[-R,R]^2\right) \setminus \left(x+(-r,r)^2\right)$ where $0 \leq r \leq R$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. The square $x+[-R,R]^2$ (respectively $x+(-r,r)^2$) is called the outer square (respectively the inner square); R and r are called the outer radius and the inner radius.

If A is some square annulus, the k-arm event in A is the event that there exist k paths of alternating colours from the boundary of the inner square of A to the boundary of the outer square of A. Let $1 \leq r < R$. We will write $\alpha_k(r,R)$ for the probability of this event with $A = [-R,R]^2 \setminus (-r,r)^2$ and $p = p_c = 1/2$. We will also need the notion of k-arm events in the half-plane. We use the same definitions except that we ask that the paths live in the annulus intersected with the upper half-plane $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ (and the estimates that we are going to state below are also true for the lower, right and left half-planes). Finally, we will need the notion of k-arm event in the quarter plane that is the obvious analogue in the quarter-plane. The analogues of $\alpha(r,R)$ in the half-plane and in the quarter-plane will be denoted following [GPS10] by $\alpha^+(r,R)$ and $\alpha^{++}(r,R)$.

We will write $\alpha_1(R)$ for the probability of $\{0 \leftrightarrow R\}$. Note that $\alpha_1(R) \asymp \alpha_1(1,R)$. (We will also write $\alpha_k(R) := \alpha_k(1,R)$ for any $k \geq 2$.) If $r \geq R$ then we let $\alpha_k(r,R) = 1$.

By RSW techniques we have the existence of some $C = C(k) \in (0,+\infty)$ such that for all $R \geq r$ large enough:

$$\frac{1}{C}\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^C \leq \alpha_k(r,R) \leq C\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{1/C} \tag{2.1}$$

(and the obvious analogous results for $\alpha_k^+(r,R)$ and $\alpha_k^{++}(r,R)$ are also true).

An important property (also true for α_k^+ and α_k^{++}) is the **quasi-multiplicativity** property (see [Kes87], the Appendix of [SS10] or Section 4 of [Nol08]): there exists $C = C(k) \in (0,+\infty)$ such that, for all $r_3 \geq r_2 \geq r_1 \geq 1$:

$$\frac{1}{C}\,\alpha_k(r_1,r_2)\,\alpha_k(r_2,r_3) \leq \alpha_k(r_1,r_3) \leq C\,\alpha_k(r_1,r_2)\,\alpha_k(r_2,r_3). \tag{2.2}$$

In this paper, we will only use α_4, α_2, α_1, α_3^+ and α_3^{++} (for this last quantity, we will actually only need that $\alpha_3^{++}(r,R) \leq \alpha_3^+(r,R)$). For site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$ it is proved in [LSW02] and [SW01] that:

$$\alpha_1(r,R) = (r/R)^{5/48+o(1)}, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\alpha_2(r,R) = (r/R)^{1/4}, \tag{2.4}$$

$$\alpha_4(r,R) = (r/R)^{5/4+o(1)}, \tag{2.5}$$

where $R \geq r \geq 1$ and $o(1) \to 0$ as $r/R \to 0$.

The exponent for $\alpha_3^+(r,R)$ belongs to the so-called "universal exponents" which are known for both models: let $R \geq r \geq 1$, it has been shown by Aizenman (see for example [Wer07]) that:

$$\alpha_3^+(r,R) \asymp (r/R)^2 \ . \tag{2.6}$$

For bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$, we have the following weaker estimates on $\alpha_4(r,R)$: there exists $C \in (0,+\infty)$ such that for all $R \geq r \geq 1$:

$$\frac{1}{C}\frac{1}{\alpha_1(r,R)}\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{2-1/C} \leq \alpha_4(r,R) \leq C\frac{r}{R}\sqrt{\alpha_2(r,R)}\,. \tag{2.7}$$

See the Appendix of [GPS10] for the left-hand-inequality of (2.7) and Lemma B.1 of [SS11] for the right-hand-inequality (this is not exactly the content of this lemma but it is a direct consequence of the proof since the inequality (B.6) can be replaced by $\mathbb{E}[Y_j] \lesssim \alpha_2(r,R)$). See Chapter 6 of [GS14] for more references about such inequalities.

2.2 Second moment method and exclusion sensitivity

In what follows, we fix a symmetric transition kernel K from Definition 1.2 on the sites of $\mathbb{T}$ or on the edges of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and **we work at the critical point $p = p_c = 1/2$**. We shall always denote the associated exclusion dynamical percolation process by $(\omega_K(t))_{t\geq 0}$. Inspired by the case of **i.i.d. dynamical percolation** from [HPS97, SS10, GPS10], the only strategy which is known so far to identify the existence of exceptional times is to rely on the classical second moment method. In the present setting (see for example [SS10, GPS10, GS14]), it boils down to proving the following estimate:

Proposition 2.1. *Let $f_R : \Omega_R \to \{0,1\}$ be the indicator function of the radial event $\{0 \leftrightarrow R\}$ (f_R is well defined since this event only depends on the state of the sites/edges in $\mathcal{I}_R$, see Subsection 2.1 for the definitions of Ω_R and $\mathcal{I}_R$). To prove that a.s. there exist exceptional times for a K-exclusion dynamical percolation (of parameter $p_c = 1/2$) it is sufficient to prove that there exists a constant $C = C(K) < +\infty$ such that for all $R \geq 1$:*

$$\int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[f_R(\omega_K(0))\, f_R(\omega_K(t))\right] dt \leq C\alpha_1(R)^2\,, \tag{2.8}$$

where $f_R(\omega_K(t))$ means that we apply f_R to the restriction of $\omega_K(t)$ to the sites/edges in $\mathcal{I}_R$.

Proof (sketch). First note that it follows from ergodicity that either a.s. there are exceptional times or a.s. there is no exceptional time. Hence, it is sufficient to prove that (2.8) implies that there are exceptional times with positive probability. As explained in the i.i.d. case in [SS10] (in the paragraph above Lemma 5.1, see also Proposition 11.3 in [GS14]) it is a simple consequence of a second moment inequality. The only properties of the dynamical process that are used in the paragraph above Lemma 5.1 in [SS10] are: *(a)* the fact that $\mathbb{P}_{1/2}$ is an invariant measure and *(b)* a topological property about the set of exceptional times. This topological property is Lemma 3.2 of [HPS97] that we state below in the case of the exclusion process and whose proof is exactly the same as for the i.i.d. process. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let $(\overline{\omega}_K(t))_{t\geq 0}$ be obtained from $(\omega_K(t))_{t\geq 0}$ by setting, for every $i \in \mathcal{I}$ (i.e. every edge or every site depending on the model), the set $\{t \geq 0 : \overline{\omega}_K(t)_i = 1\}$ to be the closure of $\{t \geq 0 : \omega_K(t)_i = 1\}$. Then a.s.:*

$$\{t : 0 \overset{\overline{\omega}_K(t)}{\longleftrightarrow} \infty\} = \{t : 0 \overset{\omega_K(t)}{\longleftrightarrow} \infty\}\,.$$

From now on, for any $R \geq 1$, f_R will always be the indicator function of $\{0 \leftrightarrow R\}$ (defined on Ω_R).

In Theorem 1.5 and Proposition 1.6, we are also interested in the Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptional times. We have the following proposition similar to Proposition 2.1 which provides lower-bound estimates on the Hausdorff dimension (upper-bounds are much easier to obtain, see Proposition 3.3).

Proposition 2.3. *Let $d \in [0,1]$. To prove that the Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptional times of a K-exclusion dynamical percolation (of parameter $p_c = 1/2$) is an a.s. constant larger than or equal to d, it is sufficient to show that for any $\gamma < d$ there exists a constant $C = C(K,\gamma)$ such that for all $R \geq 1$:*

$$\int_0^1 \left(\frac{1}{t}\right)^{\gamma} \mathbb{E}\left[f_R(\omega_K(0))\, f_R(\omega_K(t))\right] dt \leq C\alpha_1(R)^2 \,. \tag{2.9}$$

Proof (sketch). The fact that the Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptional times is an a.s. constant follows immediately from ergodicity. So, it is sufficient to prove that if the inequality of Proposition 2.15 holds for any $\gamma < d$, then the Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptional times is at least d. The analogous result for the i.i.d. process is proved in Section 5 of [SS10] (with ideas similar to the ideas of the proof of Proposition 2.1 and thanks to a compactness argument and classical Frostman's criterion). The proof being exactly the same for the exclusion processes, we refer to this last paper. □

As one can see in estimates (2.8) and (2.9), proving the existence of exceptional times (and estimating their "size") thus requires to obtain good enough quantitative estimates on the correlations

$$(R,t) \mapsto \mathbb{E}\left[f_R(\omega_K(0))\, f_R(\omega_K(t))\right] .$$

Usually in this situation, a legitimate intermediate problem is to analyse the **noise sensitivity** of non-degenerate percolation events (such as left-right crossing events of rectangles whose probability do not degenerate to zero as for the events $\{0 \leftrightarrow R\}$). Identifying noise sensitivity is only an intermediate step as it is far from being quantitative enough in general to imply existence of exceptional times. For example the seminal work [BKS99] on noise sensitivity was not sufficient to imply exceptional times, which was achieved only later in [SS10]. In [BKS99], Benjamini, Kalai and Schramm consider the so-called left-right crossing events of the square $[-n,n]^2$ which are Boolean functions $g_n : \{-1,1\}^{\Omega_n} \to \{0,1\}$ (see [BKS99, SS10, GPS10]). Their main theorem is to show that for any fixed $t > 0$, if one runs an **i.i.d. dynamics** then:

$$\mathrm{Cov}\left(g_n(\omega(0)), g_n(\omega(t))\right) \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \,.$$

In order to identify existence of exceptional times with a conservative dynamics such as $t \mapsto \omega_K(t)$, a legitimate first step (analogous to [BKS99] in the i.i.d. setting) is therefore to identify noise sensitivity of Boolean functions such as g_n under exclusion dynamics. This is exactly what was achieved in [BGS13] where Broman, the first author and Steif study the concept of **exclusion sensitivity of Boolean functions**. Let us say a few words about it. Consider a sequence of Boolean functions $h_R : \Omega_R = \{-1,1\}^{\mathcal{I}_R} \to \{0,1\}$ (see Subsection 2.1 for the definition of $\mathcal{I}_R$). The notion of exclusion sensitivity is defined as the analogue of the notion of noise sensitivity ([BKS99]) in the context of exclusion processes. More precisely, the sequence $(h_R)_R$ is said ***K*-exclusion sensitive** if for all $t > 0$:

$$\mathrm{Cov}\left(h_R(\omega_K(0)), h_R(\omega_K(t))\right) \underset{R\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \,,$$

where as above $h_R(\omega_K(t))$ means that we apply h_R to the restriction of $\omega_K(t)$ to the sites/edges in $\mathcal{I}_R$.

In [BGS13], it is proved that, if g_n is the above event that there is an open crossing in the square $[-n,n]^2$ and if $K = K^\alpha$ is an α-power law kernel on the sites of $\mathbb{T}$ with α sufficiently small (see Definition 1.2), then $(g_n)_n$ is K^α-exclusion sensitive. (Actually, the

matrices studied in [BGS13] are not exactly the α-stable matrices from Definition 1.2 but their methods apply to these last matrices at least with α small.)

As we shall see in the next subsections, both for i.i.d. and exclusion dynamics, the main technology behind identifying noise sensitivity and exceptional times turns out to be a careful spectral analysis of Boolean functions such as g_n and f_R. As we will see in more details, it is useful to keep in mind the following informal distinction between the two:

i) Identifying **noise sensitivity** corresponds to proving that most of the spectral mass of g_n or f_R is supported on large frequencies (possibly in a quantitative manner, i.e. most of the spectral mass is supported on sets of size n^α for example).

ii) While identifying **exceptional times** requires a much more delicate analysis of the spetral mass: quantitative upper-bounds on the **lower tail** of $\widehat{f}_R$ are required (see [SS10, GPS10]).

2.3 The spectral sample in the i.i.d. setting

To prove that the hypothesis of Proposition 2.1 is true (for the transition matrices of Theorem 1.5 and Proposition 1.6), we will study the quantities $\mathbb{E}\left[f_R(\omega_K(0))\, f_R(\omega_K(t))\right]$, first by following ideas of [BGS13] and then by using theorems about the **spectral sample** of f_R (this object will be defined later in this section). What we first need is the notion of **Fourier decomposition of Boolean functions** that is used as a tool to study percolation in the seminal work [BKS99] (see also [GS14]). In this context, we see f_R as an element of $L^2\left(\Omega_R, \mathbb{P}_{1/2}\right)$ i.e. the space of functions from Ω_R to $\mathbb{R}$ endowed with the scalar product $< h, h' >= \mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h(\omega)h'(\omega)\right]$ where $\mathbb{P}_{1/2}$ can be seen equivalently as the restriction to Ω_R of the usual $\mathbb{P}_{1/2}$ defined on $\Omega = \{-1, 1\}^{\mathcal{I}}$ or as the uniform measure on Ω_R. For every $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$ and every $\omega \in \Omega_R$, define:

$$\chi_S(\omega) = \prod_{i \in S} \omega_i \,.$$

(In particular $\chi_\emptyset$ is the constant function 1.)

It is not difficult to check that $(\chi_S)_{S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R}$ is an orthonormal basis of $L^2\left(\Omega_R, \mathbb{P}_{1/2}\right)$. Therefore, for any function $h = h_R \in L^2\left(\Omega_R, \mathbb{P}_{1/2}\right)$ we can define the Fourier decomposition of h as the unique family of real numbers $(\widehat{h}(S))_{S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R}$ such that:

$$h = \sum_{S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R} \widehat{h}(S)\, \chi_S \,.$$

(Note that $\widehat{h}(\emptyset) = \mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h(\omega)\right]$.)

The reason to introduce this orthonormal basis is that it diagonalizes the i.i.d. dynamics $t \mapsto \omega(t)$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\chi_S(\omega(0))\chi_{S'}(\omega(t))\right] = \delta_{S,S'}\, e^{-t|S|} \,,$$

therefore:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[h(\omega(0))h(\omega(t))\right] = \sum_{S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R} \widehat{h}(S)^2 e^{-t|S|} \,.$$

To gain more geometric intuitions, it is interesting to view the coefficients $\widehat{h}(S)^2$ as weights of a probability measure on the sets $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$. This is the approach chosen in [GPS10] where the following definition is used:

Definition 2.4. Let $R \geq 1$ and $h \in L^2\left(\Omega_R, \mathbb{P}_{1/2}\right) \setminus \{0\}$. A **spectral sample** of h is a random variable on the sets $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$ whose distribution $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_h$ is given by:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_h\left[\{S\}\right] = \frac{\widehat{h}(S)^2}{\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h(\omega)^2\right]} \,. \tag{2.10}$$

(We will write $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_h$ for the corresponding expectation.) Note that if $h = f_R$ then $\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h(\omega)^2\right] = \alpha_1(R)$. We will sometimes need the un-normalized measure $\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_h$ given by:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_h\left[\{S\}\right] = \widehat{h}(S)^2\,.$$

For some ideas behind the study of the spectral sample and its links with the pivotal set we refer to [GS14], Chapters 9 and 10.

We now state one of the main theorems from [GPS10] which quantifies exactly what is the **lower tail** of the spectral measure of the above Boolean functions $f_R : \Omega_R \to \{0,1\}$ defined as the indicator functions of $\{0 \leftrightarrow R\}$. This theorem is stated for our two models: site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$ and bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

Theorem 2.5 (Theorem 7.3 of [GPS10], see also Theorem 10.22 in [GS14] and Exercise 10.7 of [GS14] for the lower-bound part)**.** *Let $R \geq r \geq 1$, then:*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S| < r^2\alpha_4(r)\right] \asymp \frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(r)}\,.$$

Let $\rho(l) = \inf\{r : r^2\alpha_4(r) \geq l\}$. The above estimate implies that there exists some $C < +\infty$ such that, for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and all $R \geq 1$:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S| < l\right] \leq C\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(\rho(l))}\,.$$

Using this spectral estimate (which is highly non-trivial), it is not very hard to deduce the existence of exceptional times for **i.i.d. dynamical percolation** on $\mathbb{T}$ and $\mathbb{Z}^2$ at $p = p_c$. Indeed writing:

$$\mathbb{E}\big[f_R(\omega(0))f_R(\omega(t))\big] = \sum_{S\subseteq\mathcal{I}_R}\widehat{f}_R(S)^2e^{-t|S|} = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{f_R}\left[e^{-t|S|}\right]$$

and using the above theorem, it is rather straightforward to check that the hypothesis from Propositions 2.1 and 2.3 are satisfied (see [GPS10, GS14]).

2.4 Spectral representation of correlations in the conservative case

In order to apply the above strategy for a ***K*-exclusion dynamics**, the first natural idea would be to decompose the Boolean functions f_R and g_n on an appropriate basis which diagonalizes the dynamics $t \mapsto \omega_K(t)$. Unfortunately such basis are both non-local and non-explicit, therefore we still project the Boolean functions f_R on the above basis $\{\chi_S\}_S$ to the cost of having additional non-diagonal terms.

As observed in [BGS13], for all $S, S' \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$ one has the following simple correlation structure

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\chi_S(\omega_K(0))\,\chi_{S'}(\omega_K(t))\right] = K_t(S,S')\,, \tag{2.11}$$

where the transition matrix K_t on sets S is defined as follows.

Definition 2.6. If S and S' are two finite sets of E we write:

$$K_t(S,S') = \mathbb{P}\left[\pi_t(S) = S'\right]\,, \tag{2.12}$$

where π_t is the random permutation used in Appendix A to obtain a graphical construction of the exclusion process $t \mapsto \omega_K(t)$. It is not difficult to see that K_t is a symmetric matrix and that, if $|S| \neq |S'|$, then $K_t(S,S') = 0$. We deduce that, for any non-negative integers $k \leq l$, K_t defines a symmetric transition matrix on the sets $S \subseteq E$ that satisfy $|S| \in [k,l]$.

Remark 2.7. The correlation formula (2.11) is used throughout in [BGS13]. It is reminiscent of the so-called **duality formula** for exclusion processes. Note that our assumption that the kernels K from Definition 1.2 is **symmetric** is crucial if one wants to rely on (2.11).

The importance of this duality formula (as used in [BGS13]) is due to its following consequence. One has for any Boolean function $h = h_R : \Omega_R = \{-1,1\}^{\mathcal{I}_R} \to \{0,1\}$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[h(\omega_K(0))\, h(\omega_K(t))\right] = \sum_{S,S' \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R} \widehat{h}(S)\widehat{h}(S') K_t(S,S')\,. \tag{2.13}$$

2.5 Outline of proof and new spectral estimates

Let us now give a short outline of our main result, Theorem 1.5 as well as its easier analogue Proposition 1.6. In order to prove the existence of exceptional times, it is sufficient to show (combining Proposition 2.1 with equation (2.13)) that there exists $C = C(K) < +\infty$ such that uniformly in $R \geq 1$:

$$\int_0^1 \sum_{S,S' \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[\{S\}\right]} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[\{S'\}\right]}\, K_t(S,S')\, dt \leq C\alpha_1(R)\,. \tag{2.14}$$

(The fact that it is $\alpha_1(R)$ on the right-hand-side instead of $\alpha_1(R)^2$ as in (2.8) is due to the fact that the spectral measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}$ is renormalized by $\alpha_1(R)$, see equation (2.10).) To obtain a lower-bound on the Hausdorff dimension of these exceptional times, one needs to show the following strengthening: there exists $C = C(K,\gamma) < +\infty$ such that for all $R \geq 1$:

$$\int_0^1 \left(\frac{1}{t}\right)^{\gamma} \sum_{S,S' \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[\{S\}\right]} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[\{S'\}\right]}\, K_t(S,S')\, dt \leq C\alpha_1(R)\,. \tag{2.15}$$

As in Proposition 2.3, the larger the value of γ is, the better the lower-bound on the Hausdorff dimension is.

In order to explain the intuition which underlies our proofs, let us write informally the above sum as "$\left\langle \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}}\,,\, K_t \star \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}} \right\rangle$". With this in mind, our purpose becomes to show that "$\sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}}$ and $K_t \star \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}}$ are asymptotically singular". One way to interpret this is as follows: if we let a spectral sample (of f_R) evolve under a K-exclusion process for some time $t > 0$, then it does not look like a spectral sample any more. In other words, if we sample a spectral sample $\mathcal{S} \sim \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}$ independently of our exclusion process and if we let π_t be the permutations defined in (A.1), then, for any fixed $t > 0$, and for R sufficiently large, $\pi_t(\mathcal{S})$ does not look like a typical spectral sample any more. In order to prove this, one needs to identify "almost sure" properties of the spectral sample $\mathcal{S} \sim \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}$ which will no longer hold (with high probability) for $\pi_t(\mathcal{S})$, namely after diffusion. The main mathematical issue we face here is that the actual purpose of the previous works about the spectral sample was to estimate its size (as one can see for example from the above Theorem 2.5 from [GPS10]). This is not what we are interested in here since the size of $\mathcal{S}$ is exactly the same as the size of $\pi_t(\mathcal{S})$.

What will help us is that the strategy in [GPS10] is to study closely the geometry of the spectral sample. As such our strategy will consist in identifying "almost sure" geometric properties of $\mathcal{S} \sim \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}$ which will no longer hold for $\pi_t(\mathcal{S})$.

This strategy is close to the strategy of [BGS13] for the proof of exclusion sensitivity of the left-right crossing events. There is a significant difference though (very similar to the difference between [BKS99] and [SS10]) as we need to obtain quantitative bounds essentially on the **"lower tail"** (i.e. on the atypically small spectral samples $|\mathcal{S}| \ll \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{f_R}\left[|S|\right]$). The difficulty behind this is that we will need to find singularities for all sizes of spectral samples. More precisely, let g_n be the indicator function of the crossing of $[-n,n]^2$ from left to right. What the authors of [BGS13] had to show to prove K-exclusion sensitivity of $(g_n)_n$ is:

$$\sum_{\emptyset \neq S,S' \subseteq \mathcal{I}_n} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{g_n}\left[\{S\}\right]} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{g_n}\left[\{S'\}\right]}\, K_t(S,S') \underset{n \to +\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0\,.$$

Thanks to [GPS10], Theorem 1.1 (and thanks to Cauchy-Schwarz and Markov property of $K_t(S,\cdot)$), it is easy to see that

$$\sum_{\substack{\emptyset\neq S,S'\subseteq\mathcal{I}_n:\\ |S|=|S'|\ll\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{g_n}[|S|] \text{ or } |S|=|S'|\gg\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{g_n}[|S|]}} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{g_n}[\{S\}]}\sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{g_n}[\{S'\}]} \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0\,.$$

This way, the authors of [BGS13] only had to take into account the sets S whose size is roughly $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{g_n}[|S|]$. This makes the analysis in [BGS13] easier as in this regime, the spectral sample $\mathcal{S}\sim\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{g_n}$ is known to be essentially "fractal". In our present setting, one cannot avoid a detailed analysis of what happens in the lower tail. Indeed if one would apply the same trick (Cauchy-Schwarz and Markov property) to small spectral sets of size $|\mathcal{S}|<r^2\alpha_4(r)$ with $r\ll R$ and $\mathcal{S}\sim\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}$, then one would obtain thanks to Theorem 2.5 the following bound: for all $t>0$,

$$\sum_{\substack{\emptyset\neq S,S'\subseteq\mathcal{I}_R:\\ |S|=|S'|<r^2\alpha_4(r)}} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[\{S\}]}\sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[\{S'\}]}\,K_t(S,S') \le O(1)\,\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(r)}\,.$$

Clearly, such a bound is not quantitative enough to imply what we need, namely:

$$\int_0^1 \sum_{S,S'\subseteq\mathcal{I}_R} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[\{S\}]}\sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[\{S'\}]}\,K_t(S,S')\,dt \le O(1)\,\alpha_1(R)\,.$$

Because of this, we are required to identify a geometric singularity between $\mathcal{S}\sim\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}$ and $\pi_t(\mathcal{S})$ even when $\mathcal{S}$ is atypically small. In other words, we need to quantify the singularity between the sub-probability measures (when $r\ll R$):

$$\mathbb{1}_{|S|<r^2\alpha_4(r)}\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}(dS) \quad\text{and}\quad K_t\star\left[\mathbb{1}_{|S|<r^2\alpha_4(r)}\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}(dS)\right].$$

Imagine for a second that such small spectral sets would typically look (under the conditional measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[\cdot\,|\,|S|<r^2\alpha_4(r)\right]$) like macroscopic "Poissonnian clouds" of points. In that case, the above sub-probability measures would even be "absolutely continuous" with respect to each other. To prevent this, the geometric feature of these small spectral sets which will help us detecting singularity is a certain **clustering effect** which will be proved and made quantitative in this paper (see Theorem 2.8 below). More precisely, under the conditional measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[\cdot\,|\,|S|<r^2\alpha_4(r)\right]$, spectral sets tend to be of "small" diameter. Note that such a clustering effect is far from being obvious (techniques from [GPS10] are not well designed for such properties) and it is still an open-problem for the left-right crossing events g_n, see Conjecture 6.2. Summarising the above discussion, our proof of Theorem 1.5 is divided into the following two independent steps (see also Figure 2).

A. **Clustering property for small radial spectral sets.** This step corresponds to Theorem 2.8 below (and its Corollary 2.9). Note that this step of the proof is purely *static* (no dynamics here). It will be the purpose of Section 5.

B. **From clustering to singularity to exceptional times.** The second step of the proof consists in implementing the above clustering property into a sufficiently quantitative singular behaviour in order to obtain existence of exceptional times (main Theorem 1.5). This second step will be the purpose of Section 4.

We end this subsection with some more details for steps A and B.

A. Clustering property. Our main result on the clustering property of the spectral sample of the **radial crossing event** f_R can be stated as follows.



Figure 2: This picture illustrates our strategy for our spectral analysis of the lower tail under a K^α-exclusion dynamics. If spectral samples of radial events f_R would look like "sparse" random subsets of $\mathcal{I}_R$ as pictured on the left, it would be very hard to detect any singular behaviour between $\mathcal{S}$ and $\pi_t(\mathcal{S})$. This is why we provide a quantitative clustering property in Theorem 2.8 and Corollary 2.9 which shows that small spectral samples are with high probability concentrated in small balls (middle square). Once we combine all quantitative estimates, one can show that when the exponent α is chosen small enough, this clustering property does not hold any more after diffusion for $\pi_t(\mathcal{S})$ as pictured on the right square. This is how we manage to detect the desired (quantitative) singularity.

Theorem 2.8. *There exist an exponent $\epsilon > 0$ and a constant $C < +\infty$ such that, for all $1 \le r \le r_0 \le R/2$:*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[0 < |S \setminus (-r_0, r_0)^2| < r^2 \alpha_4(r)\right] \le C \frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(r_0)} \left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon} \alpha_4(r, r_0)\,.$$

(As explained in Remark 4.5, this exponent $\epsilon > 0$ even very small is crucial for the existence of exceptional times on $\mathbb{Z}^2$. It is related to the geometric event discussed in Appendix C, see also Remark 5.9.)

Theorem 2.8 will be proved in Subsection 5.2. Its proof is mostly inspired from the global proof in [GPS10]. There are three main steps in this last proof. We will have to adapt the first step (which is Section 4 in [GPS10]) and then we will follow the two last steps. As the treatment of the first step differs in at least three key places, we provide a reasonably self-contained proof in Subsection 5.2.1. To help identifying the differences with the proof in Section 4 of [GPS10], here are the three main ones:

1. First, one needs to introduce a new combinatorial **annulus structure** which is designed to analyse the spectral sample outside of some mesoscopic scale $(-r_0, r_0)^2$.
2. In order to analyse this modified annulus structure, we need to introduce a new geometric percolation exponent (a 4-arm event conditioned on a half-plane) which is defined in Lemma C.1. This conditioned percolation event is at the root of the exponent $\epsilon > 0$ in Theorem 2.8 and will play a significant role while analysing the modified annulus structure. A key estimate on this conditioned percolation event which is also valid on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ is proved in Appendix C. See Remark 5.9 for the link between ϵ and that conditioned event and Remark 4.5 for the importance of $\epsilon > 0$ in our proof of existence of exceptional times.
3. Finally, we need to adapt the useful spectral estimate (Lemma 4.8 in [GPS10]) to our annulus structure. That is the purpose of Appendix B.

We shall also use extensively in Section 4 the following immediate corollary of Theorem 2.8:

Corollary 2.9. *Let ϵ be the same constant as in Theorem 2.8. Then:*

1. *There exists a constant $C < +\infty$ such that, for all $1 \leq r \leq r_0$ and all $R \geq 1$:*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S| < r^2\alpha_4(r),\, S \not\subseteq (-r_0, r_0)^2\right] \leq C\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(r_0)}\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r, r_0)\,.$$

We will use this result as follows:

2. *Take $\beta > 1$ such that there exists some $\overline{k} = \overline{k}(\beta)$ such that for all $k \geq \overline{k}$ we have $\rho(2^{k+1}) \leq 2^{k\beta}$ (see Theorem 2.5 for the definition of ρ). Then, there exists a constant $C = C(\beta) < +\infty$ such that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $R \geq 1$:*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S| < 2^{k+1}, S \not\subseteq (-2^{k\beta}, 2^{k\beta})^2\right] \leq C\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(2^{k\beta})}\left(\frac{2^{k\beta}}{\rho(2^k)}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(\rho(2^k), 2^{k\beta})\,.$$

Proof. We first prove item 1. We distinguish three cases : *(a)* If $r_0 \leq R/2$, then it is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.8 since:

$$\left\{|S| < r^2\alpha_4(r),\, S \not\subseteq (-r_0, r_0)^2\right\} \subseteq \left\{0 < |S \setminus (-r_0, r_0)^2| < r^2\alpha_4(r)\right\}\,.$$

(It is possible that we have lost a lot in this inclusion, see Conjecture 6.1 for more about this.) *(b)* If $r_0 > R + 2$ then the left-hand-side equals 0 (since we have $\mathcal{I}_R \subseteq [-(R+2), R+2]^2$). *(c)* If $R/2 < r_0 \leq R+2$, then it is a simple consequence of the case $r_0 = R/2$ already proved (together with the quasi-multiplicativity property and (2.1)) since we have:

$$\left\{|S| < r^2\alpha_4(r),\, S \not\subseteq (-r_0, r_0)^2\right\} \subseteq \left\{|S| < r^2\alpha_4(r),\, S \not\subseteq (-R/2, R/2)^2\right\}\,.$$

Let us now prove item 2. We distinguish two cases: *(a)* if $k < \overline{k}$, such an estimate is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.5 (with possibly a larger constant). *(b)* We now assume that $k \geq \overline{k}$. Then, it is a direct consequence of item 1 since we have $1 \leq \rho(2^{k+1}) \leq 2^{k\beta}$ and $\rho(2^{k+1})^2\,\alpha_4(\rho(2^{k+1})) \geq 2^{k+1}$ (actually, it is not difficult to see that this last inequality is an equality). (Note also that we have used the fact that $\rho(2^{k+1}) \leq O(1)\,\rho(2^k)$, which is a simple consequence of the quasi-multiplicativity property and the left-hand-inequality of (2.7).) □

At the level of this outline, let us analyse a little more the results of Theorem 2.8 and Corollary 2.9. These results imply that if the spectral sample is small then it is "localized in the neighbourhood of the origin":

Let us estimate $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[S \subseteq (-r_0, r_0)^2 \,\middle|\, 0 < |S| < r^2\alpha_4(r)\right]$. Thanks to Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.9 we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[S \not\subseteq (-r_0, r_0)^2 \,\middle|\, 0 < |S| < r^2\alpha_4(r)\right] &\leq O(1)\,\frac{\alpha_1(r)}{\alpha_1(r_0)}\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r, r_0)\\ &\leq O(1)\,\frac{\alpha_4(r, r_0)}{\alpha_1(r, r_0)}\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\end{aligned}$$

(by quasi-multiplicativity). By the right-hand-inequality of (2.7) we know that the last line is smaller than or equal to $O(1)\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{-\epsilon}\frac{\sqrt{\alpha_2(r,r_0)}}{\alpha_1(r,r_0)} \leq O(1)\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{-\epsilon}$ (the last inequality follows from FKG-inequality) which goes to 0 as r/r_0 goes to 0. (In the case of $\mathbb{T}$, thanks to the computation of the critical exponents we even know that $\frac{\alpha_4(r,r_0)}{\alpha_1(r,r_0)}\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon} = \left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{-7/48-\epsilon+o(1)}$.)

We now state the (easier) analogue of Corollary 2.9 which will be relevant for the long-range dynamics $K^a_{\log}$, namely to prove Proposition 1.6:

Proposition 2.10. *For all $\epsilon_0 > 0$ there exists a constant $C = C(\epsilon_0) < +\infty$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and all $R \geq 1$:*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S| < k, S \not\subseteq (-\exp(k^{\epsilon_0}), \exp(k^{\epsilon_0}))^2\right] \leq C\,\alpha_1(R)\,\exp(-k^{\epsilon_0}/C)\,.$$

Proposition 2.10 is a simple consequence of Corollary 2.9 (and Theorem 2.5 for k small) but is also a direct consequence of some results of Section 4 of [GPS10] as we will explain in Subsection 5.1.

B. From clustering to singularity Let us give a short heuristics which explains how to derive our main result Theorem 1.5 using the above clustering property (the ideas behind the proof of Proposition 1.6 being the same). Take β large as in Corollary 2.9. Remember that what we want to show is that for all $t > 0$ if R is sufficiently large, then $\pi_t(\mathcal{S})$ does not look like a spectral sample. Thanks to Corollary 2.9 (and if β is sufficiently large), we know that with high probability $\mathcal{S}$ is included in the square $(-|\mathcal{S}|^\beta, |\mathcal{S}|^\beta)^2$. Remember the definition of the transition matrices K^α in Definition 1.2: each point of $\mathcal{S}$ roughly has probability $t/|\mathcal{S}|^{\alpha\beta}$ to "jump" at a distance $|\mathcal{S}|^\beta$ from the origin. So, if $\alpha \ll 1/\beta$ then with high probability there has been such a jump before time t and we have what we want: a set $\pi_t(\mathcal{S})$ that is very different from a typical spectral sample (if $|\mathcal{S}|$ is sufficiently large then $|\mathcal{S}|^\beta$ may even be larger than $R+2$ and some point of the spectral sample would have jumped outside of the domain of $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}$). As such, we see from this heuristics why our bounds are worse and worse as the exponent α increases.

In order to derive our main result (Theorem 1.5) we need a quantitative (and rigorous) version of this heuristics. That is the purpose of Section 4.

3 Warm-up without spectral analysis: proofs of Propositions 1.3 and 1.4

In this section, we prove Propositions 1.3 and 1.4. As mentioned in Subsection 1.2, the general ideas are the same as for the analogous results of [HPS97]. However, there is a slightly new difficulty due to the lack of independence and that is the reason why we need the following results Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2.

Lemma 3.1. *Let K be a symmetric transition matrix on the edges of a graph $G = (V, E)$. Consider a law μ on the set of bond percolation configurations $\Omega = \{-1, 1\}^E$ that satisfies the following: there exists $p_0 \in [0, 1]$ such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, any $e_1, \cdots, e_{n+1}$ distinct edges and any $i_1, \cdots, i_n \in \{-1, 1\}$ we have:*

$$\mu\left[\omega(e_1) = i_1, \cdots, \omega(e_n) = i_n\right] > 0$$

and:

$$\mu\left[\omega(e_{n+1}) = 1 \,\middle|\, \omega(e_1) = i_1, \cdots, \omega(e_n) = i_n\right] \leq p_0\,.$$

Then, for any increasing event $A \in \mathcal{F}$ (i.e. an event such that, if $\omega \leq \omega'$ and $\omega \in A$ then $\omega' \in A$) that depends on only finitely many edges, we have $\mu[A] \leq \mathbb{P}_{p_0}[A]$. (This lemma is also true for site percolation.)

The proof of this lemma is straightforward. It is applied in our context as follows: since our graphs are locally finite, the lemma holds with:

$$A = A_n(v) := \{\exists \text{ a self avoiding path starting at } v \text{ and of length } n \text{ made of open edges}\}\,,$$

for all n and all v. As a result, it is also true with $A = \{v \leftrightarrow \infty\}$ since we have $\{v \leftrightarrow \infty\} = \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \downarrow A_n(v)$. We deduce that, if $p_0 < p_c$, then for all v, μ-a.s. v is not in an infinite cluster. Therefore, $\mu\left[\exists \text{ an infinite cluster}\right] = 0$ since the vertex set is countable.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $p \in (0, 1)$ and consider $(\omega_K(t))_{t\geq 0}$ a K-exclusion process of parameter p. Moreover, write $\omega_K^{(\epsilon)}$ for the configuration that equals $\omega_K(0)$ except that we declare open every edge e such that a clock associated to e has rung between time 0 and time ϵ. If $e_1, \cdots, e_{n+1}$ are distinct edges and $i_1, \cdots, i_n \in \{-1, 1\}$, then:*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\omega_K^{(\epsilon)}(e_{n+1}) = 1 \,\middle|\, \omega_K^{(\epsilon)}(e_1) = i_1, \cdots, \omega_K^{(\epsilon)}(e_n) = i_n\right] \leq p + \frac{1-p}{p}\epsilon\,.$$

(This lemma is also true for site percolation.)

Proof. Write $C^{(\epsilon)}_{e,f}$ for the event that the clock of $\{e,f\}$ has rung between time 0 and time ϵ. Consider $e_1,\cdots,e_{n+1}$ and $i_1,\cdots,i_n$ as in the statement of the lemma. Note that $\omega_K(0)_{e_{n+1}}$ is independent of $\left\{\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_1)=i_1,\cdots,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_n)=i_n\right\}$ and of this last event intersected with $\{\exists f\in E,\, C^{(\epsilon)}_{e_{n+1},f}\}$. So, if we distinguish between the two cases $\omega(0)_{e_{n+1}}=1$ and $\omega(0)_{e_{n+1}}=-1$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left[\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_{n+1})=1\,\middle|\,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_1)=i_1,\cdots,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_n)=i_n\right]\\
&=p+(1-p)\,\mathbb{P}\left[\exists f\in E,\, C^{(\epsilon)}_{e_{n+1},f}\,\middle|\,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_1)=i_1,\cdots,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_n)=i_n\right]\\
&\leq p+(1-p)\sum_{f\in E}\mathbb{P}\left[C^{(\epsilon)}_{e_{n+1},f}\,\middle|\,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_1)=i_1,\cdots,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_n)=i_n\right].
\end{aligned}$$

If $f\notin\{e_1,\cdots,e_n\}$, then $C^{(\epsilon)}_{e_{n+1},f}$ is independent of $\left\{\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_1)=i_1,\cdots,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_n)=i_n\right\}$. Moreover, if $f=e_j$ and $C^{(\epsilon)}_{e_{n+1},f}$ holds, then $\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_j)=1$. Therefore, the above equals:

$$\begin{aligned}
&p+(1-p)\Bigg(\sum_{f\notin\{e_1,\cdots,e_n\}}\mathbb{P}\left[C^{(\epsilon)}_{e_{n+1},f}\right]\\
&+\sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\cdots,n\}:\\ i_j=1}}\frac{\mathbb{P}\left[C^{(\epsilon)}_{e_{n+1},e_j},\forall k\in\{1,\cdots,n\}\setminus\{j\},\,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_k)=i_k\right]}{\mathbb{P}\left[\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_1)=i_1,\cdots,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_n)=i_n\right]}\Bigg)\\
&=p+(1-p)\Bigg(\sum_{f\notin\{e_1,\cdots,e_n\}}\left(1-e^{-\epsilon K(e_{n+1},f)}\right)\\
&+\sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\cdots,n\}:\\ i_j=1}}\left(1-e^{-\epsilon K(e_{n+1},e_j)}\right)\frac{\mathbb{P}\left[\forall k\in\{1,\cdots,n\}\setminus\{j\},\,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_k)=i_k\right]}{\mathbb{P}\left[\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_1)=i_1,\cdots,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_n)=i_n\right]}\Bigg).
\end{aligned}\tag{3.1}$$

Using that $\omega_K(0)_{e_j}$ is independent of $\left\{\forall k\in\{1,\cdots,n\}\setminus\{j\},\,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_k)=i_k\right\}$, we obtain that for all j such that $i_j=1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left[\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_1)=i_1,\cdots,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_n)=i_n\right]\\
&\geq\mathbb{P}\left[\omega_K(0)_{e_j}=1,\forall k\in\{1,\cdots,n\}\setminus\{j\},\,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_k)=i_k\right]\\
&=p\,\mathbb{P}\left[\forall k\in\{1,\cdots,n\}\setminus\{j\},\,\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K(e_k)=i_k\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (3.1) is smaller than or equal to:

$$\begin{aligned}
&p+(1-p)\sum_{f\notin\{e_1,\cdots,e_n\}}\left(1-e^{-\epsilon K(e_{n+1},f)}\right)+(1-p)\sum_{\substack{j\in\{1,\cdots,n\}\\ i_j=1}}\left(1-e^{-\epsilon K(e_{n+1},e_j)}\right)/p\\
&\leq p+(1-p)\sum_{f\in E}\left(1-e^{-\epsilon K(e_{n+1},f)}\right)/p\leq p+\frac{1-p}{p}\sum_{f\in E}\epsilon K(e_{n+1},f)=p+\frac{1-p}{p}\epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

(since K is symmetric). □

Proof of Proposition 1.3. We follow the ideas of [HPS97], proof of Proposition 1.1. Take $p<p_c$. For any edge e, if there exists some time t in $[0,\epsilon]$ such that e is open at time t, then e is open in $\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K$. Moreover, the event $\{\exists$ an infinite cluster$\}$ is increasing. Therefore, if there exists an exceptional time between time 0 and time ϵ, then there is an infinite cluster in $\omega^{(\epsilon)}_K$.

Furthermore, Lemma 3.2 implies that if ϵ is sufficiently small, then there exists $p_0 < p_c$ such that the distribution of $\omega_K^{(\epsilon)}$ satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 3.1. We deduce that if ϵ is sufficiently small then a.s. there is no exceptional time between times 0 and ϵ, which easily implies the result.

If $p > p_c$, then the same proof works with results analogous to Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 (with opposite inequalities). □

Proof of Proposition 1.4. We follow again the ideas of [HPS97], proof of Theorem 1.3. Consider a graph G, a symmetric transition matrix K on the edges of G, $p \in (0,1)$ such that $\mathbb{P}_p[\exists \text{ an infinite cluster }] = 0$ and $(\omega_K(t))_{t\geq 0}$ a K-exclusion process of parameter p. Take v a vertex of G and write $N(v)$ for the number of times $t \in [0,1]$ such that $\{v \overset{\omega_K(t)}{\longleftrightarrow} \infty\}$ holds. As explained in [HPS97] in the case of i.i.d. dynamical percolation, we can show that either $\mathbb{E}[N(v)] = 0$ or $\mathbb{E}[N(v)] = +\infty$. This is actually a consequence of general results about reversible Markov processes - see Lemma 2.3 of [PS98] - and these results are also true for our K-exclusion processes. (For more explanations and further references, see [PS98]; note that the fact that the matrices K are symmetric is important here since it implies that our exclusion processes are reversible.)

Now, take $d \geq 11$, choose K to be a symmetric transition matrix on the edges of the cubic lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and let $(\omega_K(t))_{t\geq 0}$ be a K-exclusion process of parameter $p_c = p_c(d)$ (if $p \neq p_c$ then the result is a direct consequence of Proposition 1.3). From the above observation, we deduce that, in order to prove Proposition 1.4, it is sufficient to prove that, if $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then $\mathbb{E}[N(v)] < +\infty$. That is the purpose of what follows.

We know (see [HS94] for $d \geq 19$ and the recent work [FvdH15] for the extension to $d \geq 11$) that there exists $C = C(d) < +\infty$ such that, for all $p \geq p_c = p_c(d)$:

$$\mathbb{P}_p[v \leftrightarrow \infty] \leq C(p - p_c)\,. \tag{3.2}$$

For each $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$, write $N_m(v)$ for the number of intervals of the form $I_k^m = [k/m, (k+1)/m]$, $k \in \{0, \cdots, m-1\}$, such that there exists some time $t \in I_k^m$ for which $\{v \overset{\omega_K(t)}{\longleftrightarrow} \infty\}$ holds. Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 (with $\epsilon = 1/m$) imply that:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\exists t \in I_0^m,\, v \overset{\omega_K(t)}{\longleftrightarrow} \infty\right] \leq \mathbb{P}_{p_c + C'/m}[v \leftrightarrow \infty]$$

(where $C' = (1-p_c)/p_c$). Using (3.2) we obtain:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\exists t \in I_0^m,\, v \overset{\omega_K(t)}{\longleftrightarrow} \infty\right] \leq CC'/m\,.$$

Since $\mathbb{P}_{p_c}$ is an invariant measure, we obtain that the above is also true for any I_k^m. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}[N_m(v)] \leq mCC'/m = CC' < +\infty$ and by Fatou's lemma we are done since $N(v) \leq \liminf_{m\to+\infty} N_m(v)$. □

It is a result of Kesten and Zhang [KZ87] that (3.2) fails if $d = 2$. For site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$, it has even been proved in [SW01] that:

$$\mathbb{P}_p[v \leftrightarrow \infty] = (p - 1/2)^{5/36 + o(1)}\,,$$

where $o(1)$ goes to 0 as $p \searrow 1/2$. Exactly as in the proof of Proposition 1.4, we easily deduce from it, Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 that, for any symmetric transition matrix K on the sites of $\mathbb{T}$ and any $\delta > 0$, there exists some $C = C(\delta) < +\infty$ such that for any site v of $\mathbb{T}$:

$$\mathbb{E}[N_m(v)] \leq Cm.m^{\delta - 5/36} = Cm^{\delta + 31/36}\,. \tag{3.3}$$

Inequality (3.3) is proved in [SS10] (proof of Theorem 6.3) in the case of i.i.d. dynamical percolation. Moreover, this is the only property that the authors of [SS10] use to prove that a.s. the Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptional times in the i.i.d. case is at most 31/36. Finally, we obtain the following result (and we refer to [SS10] for more details):

Proposition 3.3. *Let K be a symmetric transition matrix on the sites of $\mathbb{T}$ and consider a K-exclusion process of parameter $p = p_c = 1/2$. Then, a.s. the Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptional times is at most* $31/36$.

4 Exceptional times at criticality: proofs of Theorem 1.5 and Proposition 1.6

We will need the following lemma (which is a quantitative version of Lemma 7.1 in [BGS13]):

Lemma 4.1. *Let (E, ν) be a countable set endowed with a sub-probability measure $\nu \neq 0$. Furthermore, let P be a symmetric sub-transition matrix on the set E. Let $F \subseteq E$ and define δ, $\eta > 0$ as follows: $\nu(F) = (1-\delta)\nu(E)$, $\eta = \max_{x\in F} P(x, F)$. We have:*

$$\sum_{x,y\in E} \sqrt{\nu(x)}\sqrt{\nu(y)}P(x,y) \leq \nu(E)(\eta + 2\sqrt{\delta})\,.$$

Proof. Since P is symmetric, we have the following inequality:

$$\sum_{x,y\in E} \sqrt{\nu(x)}\sqrt{\nu(y)}P(x,y) \leq \sum_{x\in F, y\in F} \sqrt{\nu(x)}\sqrt{\nu(y)}P(x,y) + 2\sum_{x\in E, y\in E\setminus F} \sqrt{\nu(x)}\sqrt{\nu(y)}P(x,y)\,.$$

We write A_1 and A_2 for the two sums of the right-hand-side of the above inequality. Our goal is to prove that $A_1 \leq \nu(E)\,\eta$ and $A_2 \leq \nu(E)\,\sqrt{\delta}$. First note that:

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &\leq \sum_{x\in F, y\in F} \sqrt{\nu(x)}\sqrt{\nu(y)}\,\eta \\ &\leq \sum_{x\in E, y\in E} \sqrt{\nu(x)}\sqrt{\nu(y)}\,\eta \\ &\leq \nu(E)\,\eta\,. \end{aligned}$$

(for the last inequality, we have used Cauchy-Schwarz inequality). Regarding A_2, by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality twice (first for the sub-probability measures $P(x,.)$ then for the counting measure), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &= \sum_{y\in E\setminus F} \sqrt{\nu(y)} \sum_{x\in E} \sqrt{\nu(x)}P(x,y) \\ &\leq \sum_{y\in E\setminus F} \sqrt{\nu(y)} \sqrt{\sum_{x\in E} \nu(x)P(x,y)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{y\in E\setminus F} \nu(y)} \sqrt{\sum_{y\in E\setminus F} \Big(\sum_{x\in E} \nu(x)P(x,y)\Big)} \\ &= \sqrt{\nu(E)\,\delta} \sqrt{\sum_{x\in E} \nu(x)\Big(\sum_{y\in E\setminus F} P(x,y)\Big)}\,. \end{aligned}$$

We are done since $\sum_{x\in E} \nu(x)\Big(\sum_{y\in E\setminus F} P(x,y)\Big) \leq \sum_{x\in E} \nu(x) = \nu(E)$. □

Now, we use Lemma 4.1, Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.9 in order to prove Theorem 1.5. Remember (2.14) and (2.15): the quantities we are interested in are

$$\sum_{S,S'\subseteq \mathcal{I}_R} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[\{S\}]}\sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[\{S'\}]}\,K_t^\alpha(S,S')\,.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Fix $\beta > 1$ to be determined later and consider $\alpha > 0$ such that $1 - \alpha\beta > 0$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $E = E_k = E_k(R) := \left\{S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R \,:\, |S| \in [2^k, 2^{k+1} - 1]\right\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} F = F_k = F_k(\beta, R) &:= \left\{S \in E_k \,:\, S \subseteq (-2^{k\beta}, 2^{k\beta})^2\right\} \\ &:= \left\{S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R \,:\, |S| \in [2^k, 2^{k+1} - 1] \text{ and } S \subseteq (-2^{k\beta}, 2^{k\beta})^2\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\nu = \nu_k = \nu_k(R)$ be $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}$ restricted to E_k, $P = P_k^\alpha(t) = P_k^\alpha(t, R)$ be K_t^α restricted to E_k and finally let $\delta = \delta_k = \delta_k(\beta, R)$ and $\eta = \eta_k^\alpha(t) = \eta_k^\alpha(\beta, R, t)$ be as in Lemma 4.1 (if $\nu_k = 0$ for some k then we write $\delta_k = \eta_k^\alpha(t) = 0$).

Remember that if $|S| \neq |S'|$ then $K_t^\alpha(S, S') = 0$, so:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{S,S' \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[\{S\}]}\sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[\{S'\}]}\, K_t^\alpha(S, S') \\ &\qquad = \alpha_1(R) + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{S,S' \in E_k} \sqrt{\nu_k(S)}\sqrt{\nu_k(S')}\, P_k^\alpha(t)(S, S'). \end{aligned}$$

(The term $\alpha_1(R)$ is just the contribution of $S = S' = \emptyset$.) By applying Lemma 4.1 for each k, we obtain:

$$\sum_{S,S' \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[\{S\}]}\sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_n R}[\{S'\}]}\, K_t^\alpha(S, S') \leq \alpha_1(R) + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[E_k] \left(\eta_k^\alpha(t) + 2\sqrt{\delta_k}\right). \quad (4.1)$$

Theorem 2.5 gives good estimates for $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[E_k]$. It thus remains to estimate $\eta_k^\alpha(t)$ and δ_k.

An estimate for $\eta_k^\alpha(t)$ We first prove the following lemma:

Lemma 4.2. *There exists $c_1 = c_1(\alpha, \beta) > 0$ such that, for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:*

$$\eta_k^\alpha(t) \leq \frac{1}{c_1} \exp\left(-c_1 t 2^{k(1-\alpha\beta)}\right).$$

Proof. In this proof, we write A_k^β for the annulus $[-2^{k\beta+4}, 2^{k\beta+4}]^2 \setminus (-2^{k\beta}, 2^{k\beta})^2$. Remember that $\mathcal{I} = \cup_R \mathcal{I}_R$ is the set of all the edges/sites. Consider some $S \in F_k$ and, for any $i \in S$, write $B(i)$ for the event that the following properties hold in the K^α-exclusion process:

1. there exists exactly one element $j \in \mathcal{I} \setminus (-2^{k\beta}, 2^{k\beta})^2$ such that the clock of $\{i, j\}$ has rung before time t,
2. there does not exist any $j' \in \left(\mathcal{I} \cap (-2^{k\beta}, 2^{k\beta})^2\right) \setminus S$ such that the clock of $\{i, j'\}$ or the clock of $\{j, j'\}$ has rung before time t.

It is easy to show that if there exists some $i \in S$ such that $B(i)$ holds then $\pi_t(S) \not\subseteq (-2^{k\beta}, 2^{k\beta})^2$ and consequently $\pi_t(S) \notin F_k$. Therefore: $\eta_k^\alpha(t) \leq \mathbb{P}\left[\cap_{i \in S} \neg B(i)\right]$. The problem is that the $B(i)$'s are not independent. Let J be the subset of the $j \in \mathcal{I} \setminus (-2^{k\beta}, 2^{k\beta})^2$ such that there does not exist any $j' \in \left(\mathcal{I} \cap (-2^{k\beta}, 2^{k\beta})^2\right) \setminus S$ such that the clock of $\{j, j'\}$ has rung before time t. If we condition on J, then the $B(i)$'s are independent since $B(i)$ only depends on the clocks of pairs $\{i, j\}$ with $j \in \left(\mathcal{I} \cap (-2^{k\beta}, 2^{k\beta})^2\right) \setminus S$ or $j \in J$. Therefore we can write:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\pi_t(S) \not\subseteq (-2^{k\beta}, 2^{k\beta})^2 \,\middle|\, J\right] \leq \prod_{i \in S} \mathbb{P}\left[\neg B(i) \,\middle|\, J\right].$$

We also write $J' = J \cap A_k^\beta$. Note that the events $\{j \in J'\}$ for all $j \in A_k^\beta$ are independent of each other. Moreover, if $j \in \mathcal{I} \cap A_k^\beta$, then the probability that it belongs to J' is larger than or equal to the probability that no clock associated to j has rung before time t, which is e^{-1}. Therefore, $|J'| \succeq \mathrm{Bin}\left(|A_k^\beta|, e^{-1}\right)$ where (for two random variables X, Y with values in $\mathbb{N}$) $X \succeq Y$ means that, for all n, $\mathbb{P}[X \geq n] \geq \mathbb{P}[Y \geq n]$. By classical properties of the Binomial

distribution, it is not difficult to deduce that there exists some constant $M < +\infty$ such that the probability that $|J'| < 2^{2k\beta}/M$ is at most $M(1-1/M)^{2^{2k\beta}}$. We choose such a constant M and we write:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\pi_t(S) \not\subseteq (-2^{k\beta}, 2^{k\beta})^2\right] \;\leq\; \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i\in S}\mathbb{P}\left[\neg B(i)\,\middle|\, J\right]\mathbb{1}_{|J'|\geq 2^{2k\beta}/M}\right] \;+\; M(1-1/M)^{2^{2k\beta}}.$$

What remains to estimate is $\mathbb{P}\left[\neg B(i)\,\middle|\, J\right]$ on the event $\{|J'| \geq 2^{2k\beta}/M\}$. First we observe that there exists some $c_0 = c_0(\alpha,\beta) > 0$ such that, if we condition on any J, then for all $i \in S$:

1. With probability larger than $c_0\, t$ the clock of i has rung exactly one time between times 0 and t (recall we assume $t \in [0,1]$).
2. For each $j \in J'$, on the conditioning that the clock of i has rung exactly one time between times 0 and t, the probability that j is the other site associated to this clock is larger than $c_0/2^{k\beta(2+\alpha)}$.

Moreover, if these events happen, then $B(i)$ holds. Therefore, if we condition on some J such that $|J'| \geq 2^{2k\beta}/M$ then, for any $v \in S$, the probability that $B(i)$ holds is larger than or equal to $c_0\, t\,(c_0/2^{k\beta(2+\alpha)})\,(2^{2k\beta}/M) = c_0^2 t 2^{-k\beta\alpha}/M$. Finally, there exists some constant $c_1 = c_1(\alpha) > 0$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_k^\alpha(t) &\leq \left(1 - c_0^2 t \frac{1}{M 2^{k\beta\alpha}}\right)^{|S|} + M(1-1/M)^{2^{2k\beta}} \\
&\leq \left(1 - c_1 t \frac{1}{2^{k\alpha\beta}}\right)^{2^k} + M(1-1/M)^{2^{2k\beta}} \\
&\leq \exp\left(-c_1 t 2^{k(1-\alpha\beta)}\right) + M(1-1/M)^{2^{2k\beta}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{c_1}\exp\left(-c_1 t 2^{k(1-\alpha\beta)}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

(since $|S| \leq 2^k$ and if c_1 is chosen sufficiently small). □

We now use Theorem 2.5. First note that the left-hand-inequality of (2.7) (that is stated for (r,R) but that we use for $(1,\rho(l))$) implies that:

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_1(\rho(l))} \leq \frac{1}{c_2}\,\left(\rho(l)^2\,\alpha_4(\rho(l))\right)\rho(l)^{-c_2} = \frac{1}{c_2}\,l\,\rho(l)^{-c_2}\,,$$

for some $c_2 > 0$ (we have also used that $\rho(l)\alpha_4(\rho(l)) = l$, which is a simple consequence of the definition of ρ). Note also that $\rho(l) \geq \sqrt{l}$ (since $r^2\alpha_4(r) \leq r^2$). Therefore, by using Theorem 2.5 we obtain that there exists some $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_+$:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S| < l\right] \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon_1}\alpha_1(R)(l/2)^{1-\epsilon_1} \tag{4.2}$$

(the constant 2 is there only to simplify the calculation below). We fix such an ϵ_1 for the rest of the proof. We can (and do) assume that $\epsilon_1 \in (0,1)$.

We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[E_k\right]\,\eta_k^\alpha(t) \leq \frac{1}{c_1}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[E_k]\exp\left(-c_1 t 2^{k(1-\alpha\beta)}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{c_1}\sum_{k'\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}\,:\,\left(\frac{2^{k'}-1}{c_1 t}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha\beta}}\leq 2^j < \left(\frac{2^{k'+1}-1}{c_1 t}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha\beta}}}\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[E_j]\exp\left(-c_1 t 2^{j(1-\alpha\beta)}\right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{c_1}\sum_{k'\in\mathbb{N}}\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S| < 2\left(\frac{2^{k'+1}-1}{c_1 t}\right)^{1/(1-\alpha\beta)}\right]\exp\left(-(2^{k'}-1)\right)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

We now use (4.2). It implies that the above is at most:

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon_1 c_1}\alpha_1(R)\sum_{k'\in\mathbb{N}}\left(\frac{2^{k'+1}-1}{c_1 t}\right)^{(1-\epsilon_1)/(1-\alpha\beta)}\exp\left(-(2^{k'}-1)\right)$$
$$= C'\alpha_1(R)\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)^{(1-\epsilon_1)/(1-\alpha\beta)}, \tag{4.3}$$

for some constant $C' = C'(\alpha,\beta) < +\infty$.

Remark 4.3. Notice from the above inequalities that it was important to obtain a relatively sharp upper-bound on $\eta_k^\alpha(t)$ in Lemma 4.2 in order to optimise the exponent of $(1/t)$ in (4.3).

An estimate for δ_k We have the following estimate about δ_k which is a direct consequence of Corollary 2.9 since $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[E_k]\,\delta_k = \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S| \in [2^k, 2^{k+1}-1],\, S \not\subseteq (-2^{k\beta}, 2^{k\beta})^2\right]$.

Lemma 4.4. *If β satisfies the hypothesis of Corollary 2.9 (i.e. if it is sufficiently large) then there exists some constant $C = C(\beta) < +\infty$ such that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[E_k]\,\delta_k \le C\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(2^{k\beta})}\left(\frac{2^{k\beta}}{\rho(2^k)}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(\rho(2^k), 2^{k\beta}),$$

where ϵ is as in Theorem 2.8.

Assume that β satisfies the hypothesis of Corollary 2.9. Thanks to Theorem 2.5, Lemma 4.4 and the quasi-multiplicativity property, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[E_k]\sqrt{\delta_k}\\
&= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[E_k]}\sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[E_k]\delta_k}\\
&\le \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S| < 2^{k+1}\right]}\sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[E_k]\delta_k}\\
&\le O(1)\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\sqrt{\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(\rho(2^k))}}\sqrt{\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(2^{k\beta})}\left(\frac{2^{k\beta}}{\rho(2^k)}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(\rho(2^k), 2^{k\beta})}\\
&\le O(1)\,\alpha_1(R)\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\sqrt{\frac{1}{\alpha_1(\rho(2^k))\,\rho(2^k)^{1-\epsilon}\,\alpha_4(\rho(2^k))}\frac{2^{k\beta(1-\epsilon)}\,\alpha_4(2^{k\beta})}{\alpha_1(2^{k\beta})}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Thanks to (2.1) we know that (for $r \ge 1$):

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_1(\rho(r))\,\rho(r)^{1-\epsilon}\,\alpha_4(\rho(r))} \le O(1)\,r^{O(1)}. \tag{4.5}$$

Thanks to the right-hand-inequality of (2.7) (that is stated for (r,R) but that we use for $(1,r)$) and thanks to FKG-inequality (that implies $\alpha_2(r) \le \alpha_1(r)^2$), we know that for all $r \ge 1$:

$$\frac{r^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r)}{\alpha_1(r)} \le \frac{r^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r)}{\sqrt{\alpha_2(r)}} \le O(1)\,r^{-\epsilon}. \tag{4.6}$$

Note that for bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ we do not have a better estimate: we only know that $\frac{r\,\alpha_4(r)}{\alpha_1(r)} \le O(1)$ (in particular it is not proved that $\alpha_2(r) \le O(1)\,r^{-h}\,\alpha_1(r)^2$ for some fixed $h > 0$, see (9.2) in [SS10] for more about this estimate). However, for site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$ it is known that $\frac{r\,\alpha_4(r)}{\alpha_1(r)} = r^{-7/48+o(1)}$.

From (4.5) and (4.6), we deduce that there exist some constants $\beta_0 < +\infty$ and $c_3 > 0$ such that for all $\beta' \geq \beta_0$ (and for all $r \geq 1$) we have:

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_1(\rho(r))\,\rho(r)\,\alpha_4(\rho(r))}\,\frac{r^{\beta'(1-\epsilon)}\,\alpha_4(r^{\beta'})}{\alpha_1(r^{\beta'})} \leq \frac{1}{c_3} r^{-c_3}\,. \tag{4.7}$$

We now consider some β that satisfies the hypothesis of Corollary 2.9 and that is larger than or equal to β_0. With such a choice we have:

$$\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_+} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[E_k]\sqrt{\delta_k} \leq O(1)\,\alpha_1(R) \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{c_3} 2^{-kc_3}} \leq O(1)\,\alpha_1(R)\,. \tag{4.8}$$

Remark 4.5. We see from this proof (in particular from (4.6) and the explanation below (4.6)) that the exponent ϵ in Theorem 2.8 is crucial in order to obtain exceptional times on $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Notice in particular the nice decoupling of scales in (4.4) (under the square root). Even if the exponent ϵ is very small, one can tune β to be large enough so that the right-hand-side in (4.4) wins against the left-hand-side. This is the main constraint which prevents us from obtaining exceptional times for larger values of α (see Figure 1 for the range of α we manage to cover with these estimates).

End of the proof We are now in shape to prove that if α is sufficiently small then a.s. there are exceptional times. Thanks to (2.14) we know that it is sufficient to prove that there exists some $C = C(\alpha) < \infty$ such that for all $R \geq 1$:

$$\int_0^1 \sum_{S,S'\subseteq\mathcal{I}_R} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[\{S\}\right]}\sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[\{S'\}\right]}\,K_t^{\alpha}(S,S')\,dt \leq C\alpha_1(R)\,. \tag{4.9}$$

We first choose β that satisfies the hypothesis of Corollary 2.9 and that is larger than or equal to β_0 (which was chosen in the paragraph above). Next, we choose $\alpha > 0$ sufficiently small so that $0 < (1-\epsilon_1)/(1-\alpha\beta) < 1$ (so in particular $1 - \alpha\beta > 0$). With these choices, (4.9) is a direct consequence of (4.1), (4.3) and (4.8).

The Hausdorff dimension and the constant $\alpha_0 = 217/816$ In this paragraph, we prove lower-bounds estimates on the Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptional times (for upper-bounds, see Proposition 3.3). We only work with site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$ and we use the computations of the arm-exponents, see Subsection 2.1. Thanks to these computations (that imply in particular that $\rho(l) = l^{4/3+o(1)}$) we can say that:

1. in (4.2), we could write $\frac{1}{\epsilon_1}(k/2)^{\zeta}$ instead of $\frac{1}{\epsilon_1}(k/2)^{1-\epsilon_1}$ for any $\zeta > (5/48)\cdot(4/3) = 5/36$,
2. in Corollary 2.9, the hypothesis about β is satisfied for any $\beta > 4/3$,
3. any $\beta_0 > (17/36)\cdot(48/7) = 68/21$ satisfies (4.7) (for some $c_3 > 0$). Let us detail a little this result: it comes from the two following calculations:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\alpha_1(\rho(r))\,\rho(r)\,\alpha_4(\rho(r))} &= r^{(5/48)\cdot(4/3)-4/3+(5/4)\cdot(4/3)+o(1)} \\ &= r^{17/36+o(1)}\,,\end{aligned}$$

and:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{r^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r)}{\alpha_1(r)} &\leq \frac{r\,\alpha_4(r)}{\alpha_1(r)} \\ &= r^{1-5/4+5/48+o(1)} \\ &= r^{-7/48+o(1)}\,.\end{aligned}$$

We obtain that our result of existence of exceptional times holds for any α such that $(5/36)/(1-68\alpha/21) < 1$ i.e. for any $\alpha < \alpha_0 = 217/816$. Actually, we can do a little better by taking into account the ϵ of Theorem 2.8 (which is the same ϵ as in Lemma 4.4). By Remark 5.9 we know that in Theorem 2.8 we can choose any $\epsilon < (-5/4 + \zeta_4^{|\mathbb{H}}) \wedge 1/4$ where $\zeta_4^{|\mathbb{H}}$ is defined in Proposition C.2. Therefore, any β_0 larger than

$$\frac{17}{36} \cdot \left(\frac{7}{48} + \left((-\frac{5}{4} + \zeta_4^{|\mathbb{H}}) \wedge \frac{1}{4} \right) \right)^{-1}$$

can satisfy (4.7) if ϵ is well chosen. Finally, our result of existence of exceptional times for site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$ holds for any α such that:

$$\frac{5}{36} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \alpha \cdot \frac{17}{36} \cdot \left(\frac{7}{48} + \left((-\frac{5}{4} + \zeta_4^{|\mathbb{H}}) \wedge \frac{1}{4} \right) \right)^{-1}} < 1 \,,$$

i.e. for any α less than:

$$\left(1 - \frac{5}{36}\right) \cdot \frac{36}{17} \cdot \left(\frac{7}{48} + \left((-\frac{5}{4} + \zeta_4^{|\mathbb{H}}) \wedge \frac{1}{4} \right) \right) = \frac{217}{816} + \frac{31 \cdot \left((-\frac{5}{4} + \zeta_4^{|\mathbb{H}}) \wedge \frac{1}{4} \right)}{17} \,. \tag{4.10}$$

Let us now introduce the function $d(\alpha) := 1 - \frac{5}{36} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{68}{21}\alpha}$ which was plotted in Figure 1. We also obtain from the above analysis that for any $\alpha > 0$ such that $(5/36)/(1-68\alpha/21) < 1$ and any exponent $\gamma < 1 - d(\alpha)$, one has

$$\int_0^1 \left(\frac{1}{t}\right)^\gamma \sum_{S,S' \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[\{S\}]} \sqrt{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[\{S'\}]} \, K_t^\alpha(S,S') \, dt \leq C \alpha_1(R) \,,$$

for some $C = C(\alpha, \gamma) < +\infty$. Combined with (2.15) it implies the result of Theorem 1.5 about the Hausdorff dimension. (Actually, by taking into account the ϵ of Theorem 2.8 as above, we can go slightly above the quantity $d(\alpha)$ and we can prove that the Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptional times belongs to $(d(\alpha), 31/36]$.) □

We now use Lemma 4.1, Theorem 2.5 and Proposition 2.10 in order to prove Proposition 1.6.

Proof of Proposition 1.6. Consider $a > 0$. The steps are exactly the same as for Theorem 1.5 with the following analogous definitions (where $\epsilon_0 > 0$ is such that $1 - \epsilon_0(1+a) > 0$): $E_k = \{S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R \,:\, |S| = k\}$, $F_k = \{S \in E_k \,:\, S \subseteq (-\exp((k+1)^{\epsilon_0}), \exp((k+1)^{\epsilon_0}))^2\}$, $\nu_k = \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}$ restricted to E_k, $P_k^a(t) = K_{\log,t}^a$ restricted to E_k. We write δ_k and $\eta_k^a(t)$ as in Lemma 3.1. With same arguments as in Lemma 4.2 we obtain the existence of some $c_1 = c_1(a, \epsilon_0) > 0$ such that:

$$\eta_k^a(t) \leq \frac{1}{c_1} \exp\left(-c_1 t k^{1-\epsilon_0(1+a)} \right) .$$

In the same way we obtained (4.3), we obtain (where ϵ_1 is the constant of (4.2)):

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[E_k] \; \eta_k^a(t) \leq C' \alpha_1(R) \left(\frac{1}{t}\right)^{(1-\epsilon_1)/(1-\epsilon_0(1+a))} ,$$

for some $C' = C'(a, \epsilon_0) < +\infty$.

To estimate δ_k, we use Proposition 2.10 and since $\exp(k_0^\epsilon / C)$ is super-polynomial we easily obtain that:

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}[E_k] \; \sqrt{\delta_k} \leq C'' \alpha_1(R) \,,$$

for some $C'' = C''(a, \epsilon_0) < +\infty$.

Since for the two models ϵ_0 can be chosen as small as we want and since in the case of site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$ we know that we can write ζ instead of $1 - \epsilon_1$ for any $\zeta > 5/36$, we can conclude exactly as in the proof of Theorem 1.5. □

5 Clustering effect for the spectral sample

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.8 and Proposition 2.10.

The proof of the upper-bound part of Theorem 2.5 in [GPS10] is divided into three steps. The first step shows that there exists some $\theta < +\infty$ such that the following holds. If for every $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$ we write S_r for the set of squares of the grid $r\mathbb{Z}^2$ that intersect S, then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ we have:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S_r| = k\right] \leq g(k)\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(r)}\,, \tag{5.1}$$

where $g(k) = 2^{\theta \log_2^2(k+2)}$. This is Proposition 4.7 in [GPS10] (with $l = 1$).

See Subsection 5.2 for a little discussion about the two other steps. As mentioned in Subsection 2.5, the proof of Proposition 2.10 is easier than the proof of Theorem 2.8. More precisely, Proposition 2.10 is a direct consequence of the proof of (5.1) in [GPS10] whereas to prove Theorem 2.8 we will need to *(a)* prove an analogue of (5.1) and *(b)* follow the two last steps of the proof of the upper-bound part of Theorem 2.5. See a discussion (and a list) of the differences with the proof in [GPS10] in Subsection 2.5.

Remember that $\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_{f_R} = \alpha_1(R)\,\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}$. For some proofs of Section 5, it will be more convenient to deal with $\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_{f_R}$ than with $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}$.

5.1 A very small spectral sample not localized in the neighbourhood of the origin

Proof of Proposition 2.10. As explained above, it is a simple consequence of Corollary 2.9 but it is also a direct consequence of the proofs in Section 4 of [GPS10]. Let us say a little more on this. Consider $\epsilon_0 > 0$. What we want to prove is the existence of some $C = C(\epsilon_0) < +\infty$ such that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_{f_R}\left[|S| < k, S \not\subseteq (-\exp(k^{\epsilon_0}), \exp(k^{\epsilon_0}))^2\right] \leq C\alpha_1(R)^2 \exp(-k^{\epsilon_0}/C)\,.$$

In Subsection 4.2 of [GPS10] the authors prove an analogue of (5.1) for the indicator function of the crossing of the square g_n while (5.1) itself is proved in Subsection 4.4 of [GPS10]. In Remark 4.5 of [GPS10], it is explained why the proof of Subsection 4.2 implies a clustering effect for the spectral sample of g_n conditioned to be of size less than $\log(n)$. With same ideas, a clustering effect for the spectral sample of f_R can be extracted from Subsection 4.4 of [GPS10] and we can thus obtain Proposition 2.10. □

5.2 A spectral sample with a little part not localized in the neighbourhood of the origin

Let us recall what are the three main steps in [GPS10] in order to prove the upper-bound part of Theorem 2.5:

1. The estimate (5.1) on the probability of a very small spectrum.
2. The following result on the independence structure of the spectral sample (this is not exactly the result stated in [GPS10] but the proof is exactly the same):

   Proposition 5.1 (Proposition 5.12 in [GPS10])**.** *Let $1 \leq r \leq R$ and let $\mathcal{S}_{f_R}$ be a spectral sample of f_R. Also, let $W \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$ and let $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ be a $l \times l'$ rectangle such that: (a) $r \leq l, l' \leq 2r$ and (b) $W \cap B = \emptyset$. Let $B' \subset B$ be the concentric square with side length $r/3$. Suppose that $B' \subset [-R, R]^2$ and $B \cap [-4r, 4r]^2 = \emptyset$. We also assume that $r \geq \overline{r}$, where $\overline{r} < +\infty$ is some universal constant. Finally, let $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_r$ be a random subset of $\mathcal{I}_R$ that is independent of $\mathcal{S}_{f_R}$, where each element of $\mathcal{I}_R$ is in $\mathcal{Z}$ with probability $(r^2\alpha_4(r))^{-1}$ independently of the others. Then, there exists a universal constant $a > 0$ such that:*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mathcal{S}_{f_R} \cap B' \cap \mathcal{Z} \neq \emptyset \,\middle|\, \mathcal{S}_{f_R} \cap B \neq \emptyset = \mathcal{S}_{f_R} \cap W\right] \geq a\,.$$

Let us emphasize the fact that in the conditioning we cannot have $\mathcal{S}_{f_R} \cap W' \neq \emptyset$ for some $W' \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$. In other words, we can only deal with **negative information** about the spectral sample.

3. A large deviation result:

   Proposition 5.2 (Proposition 6.1 in [GPS10]). *Take $I \neq \emptyset$ a finite set. Let x and y be $\{0,1\}^I$-valued random variables such that a.s. $y_i \leq x_i$ for all $i \in I$. We write $X = \sum_{i\in I} x_i$ and $Y = \sum_{i\in I} y_i$. Suppose that there exists a constant $a \in (0,1]$ such that, for each $i \in I$ and every $J \subseteq I \setminus \{i\}$:*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[y_i = 1 \,\middle|\, y_j = 0 \; \forall j \in J\right] \geq a\mathbb{P}\left[x_i = 1 \,\middle|\, y_j = 0 \; \forall j \in J\right] .$$

   Then:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[Y = 0 \,\middle|\, X > 0\right] \leq \frac{1}{a}\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-aX/e\right) \,\middle|\, X > 0\right] .$$

These results combine well to prove the upper-bound part of Theorem 2.5 which is Theorem 7.3 in [GPS10]. In order to prove Theorem 2.8 we will use Propositions 5.1 and 5.2 and we will need an analogue of the estimate (5.1) where we only look at the part of the spectral sample that is outside of the box of radius r_0. In the following section, we state and prove this analogous result.

5.2.1 A spectral sample with a very little part not localized in the neighbourhood of the origin

The aim of this section is to prove the following result:

Proposition 5.3. *If $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$, write $S_r^{r_0}$ for the set of the squares of the grid $r\mathbb{Z}^2$ that intersect $S \setminus (-r_0, r_0)^2$. Then, there exist constants $\theta < +\infty$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and all $1 \leq r \leq r_0 \leq R/2$:*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S_r^{r_0}| = k\right] \leq g(k)\,\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(r_0)}\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r, r_0)\,,$$

where $g(k) = 2^{\theta log_2^2(k+2)}$.

Proof. We will prove the equivalent inequality:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_{f_R}\left[|S_r^{r_0}| = k\right] \leq g(k)\,\frac{\alpha_1(R)^2}{\alpha_1(r_0)}\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r, r_0)\,. \tag{5.2}$$

The r_0-decorated centered annulus structures For the definitions and a lot of ideas of this proof, we follow [GPS10], Section 4. What is new in the present paper is how we take into account what happens near the boundary of the square $[-r_0, r_0]^2$. For this, we will have to generalize the notion of centered annulus structures that is defined below.

Definition 5.4 (Section 4 of [GPS10]). Consider $(\mathcal{A}, r_{\mathcal{A}})$ where $r_{\mathcal{A}} \in [0, R]$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is a collection of mutually percolation disjoint square annuli A that satisfy:

1. either A is included in $[-R, R]^2$ and is centered at 0. Such A are called **centered annuli**,
2. or A is included in $[-R, R]^2$ and the outer square of A does not contain 0. Such A are called **interior annuli**,
3. or A is centered at a point of a side of $[-R, R]^2$ that is at distance at least the outer radius of A from the other sides. Such A are called **side annuli**,
4. or A is centered at a corner of $[-R, R]^2$ and the outer radius of A is less than or equal to R. Such A are called **corner annuli**.

Suppose also that the annuli and $[-r_{\mathcal{A}}, r_{\mathcal{A}}]^2$ are percolation disjoint. Then, $(\mathcal{A}, r_{\mathcal{A}})$ is called a **centered annulus structure**. For each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ we write $h(A)$ for the probability of having the 1-arm event in A if A is a centered annulus, the 4-arm event in A if it is an interior annulus, the half-plane 3-arm event (in A intersected with $[-R, R]^2$) if it is a side annulus and the quarter-plane 3-arm event (in A intersected with $[-R, R]^2$) if it is a corner annulus. We will often write $\mathcal{A}$ instead of $(\mathcal{A}, r_{\mathcal{A}})$. Finally, a subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$ is said **compatible** with $\mathcal{A}$ if *(a)* for each non-centered annulus $A \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists $i \in S \cap B(A)$ where $B(A)$ is the inner square of A (more precisely, there exists $i \in S$ whose tile is included in $B(A)$) and *(b)* there is no $i \in S$ whose tile intersects $\bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A$ (see Figure 3). (In [GPS10] it is also asked that S intersects $B(A)$ for the centered annuli. That is the reason why the estimate (5.3) below is written with S whereas the same result in [GPS10] is written with $S \cup \{0\}$.)



Figure 3: A set S compatible with a centered annulus structure.

The following is Lemma 4.8 in [GPS10]: if $\mathcal{A}$ is a centered annulus structure, then:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_{f_R}\left[S \text{ is compatible with } \mathcal{A}\right] \leq \alpha_1(r_{\mathcal{A}}) \prod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} h(A)^2 \,. \tag{5.3}$$

We want to generalize it by adding some annuli centered on the boundary of $[-r_0, r_0]^2$. Consider $\mathcal{A}$ a centered annulus structure such that $r_{\mathcal{A}} = r_0$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $A_1, \cdots, A_n$ be some mutually percolation disjoint interior annuli which are percolation disjoint from all the annuli of $\mathcal{A}$. We also assume that, for all $j \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$, A_j is centered at a point of $\partial[-r_0, r_0]^2$ and is percolation disjoint from $[-r_0/2, r_0/2]^2$. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A} \cup \{A_1, \cdots, A_n\}$. We call such a set of annuli a **r_0-decorated centered annulus structure**.

We say that a subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$ is compatible with $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ if *(a)* S is compatible with $\mathcal{A}$ *(b)* for all $j \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$, there exists $i \in S$ such that the tile of i is included in the inner square of A_j and *(c)* there is no $i \in S \setminus (-r_0, r_0)^2$ whose tile intersects A_j. Note that there may exist $i \in S \cap (-r_0, r_0)^2$ whose tile intersects A_j, see Figure 4.

In order to generalize (5.3) to these r_0-decorated centered annulus structures, we need to introduce a new notation. First, if $B \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$, we write $\mathcal{F}_B$ for the σ-field of subsets of $\{-1, 1\}^{\mathcal{I}_R}$ generated by the restriction of ω to the bits in B. Next, for any $j \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$ we write $h^{r_0}(A_j)$ for the non-negative real number such that:

$$h^{r_0}(A_j)^2 = \mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[\text{4-arm event in } A_j \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}_R \cap (-r_0, r_0)^2}\right]^2\right] .$$

We now state the following analogue of (5.3), which is **one of the main steps in the present proof that differs from [GPS10]** (and whose main part is postponed to Appendix B).

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ be as above. We have:*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_{f_R}\left[S \text{ is compatible with } \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}\right] \leq \alpha_1(r_0/2) \prod_{j=1}^{n} (4\, h^{r_0}(A_j)^2) \prod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} (4\, h(A)^2) \,.$$



Figure 4: A set S compatible with a r_0-decorated centered annulus structure.

Proof. If there are only centered annuli in $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ (and more generally if $n = 0$) then it is a direct consequence of (5.3) (and we obtain the result without the factors 4; see also the end of the proof for another approach). Hence, we can assume that there exist non-centered annuli in $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$. Also, we write W for the set of the $i \in \mathcal{I}_R$ whose tile intersects some $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and of the $i \in \mathcal{I}_R \setminus (-r_0, r_0)^2$ whose tile intersects some A_j, $j \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$. If A is some annulus, let $B(A)$ be the set of the $i \in \mathcal{I}_R$ such that the tile of i is included in the inner square of A. Also, let $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}'$ be the subset of $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ whose elements are the non-centered annuli $A \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ such that the inner square of A does not contain any other annulus of $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$. We have:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_{f_R}\left[S \text{ is compatible with } \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}\right] = \widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_{f_R}\left[\forall A \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}',\, S \cap B(A) \neq \emptyset\,,\, S \cap W = \emptyset\right].$$

We now use Lemma B.2 (which is the main step in this proof). It implies that the above is at most:

$$4^{|\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}'|}\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[JP_{B(A)_{A\in\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}'}}(f_R)\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{W^c}\right]^2\right] \leq 4^{|\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}|}\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[JP_{B(A)_{A\in\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}'}}(f_R)\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{W^c}\right]^2\right].$$

Since our annuli are mutually percolation disjoint and are percolation disjoint from the square $[-r_0/2, r_0/2]^2$, the event $JP_{B(A)_{A\in\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}'}}(f_R)$ implies the 4-arm event in every interior annulus $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and in A_j for all $j \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$. Moreover, it implies the 3-arm event in A intersected with $[-R, R]^2$ for every side or corner annulus $A \in \mathcal{A}$, the 1-arm event in any centered annulus $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and the event $\{0 \leftrightarrow r_0/2\}$. For any interior annulus $A \in \mathcal{A}$ we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[\text{4-arm event in } A\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{W^c}\right]^2\right] = h(A)^2\,,$$

since the 4-arm event in A is independent of the configuration restricted to W^c. The analogous equalities hold for side, corner and centered annuli. Similarly, it is not difficult to see that for all $j \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$ we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[\text{4-arm event in } A_j\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{W^c}\right]^2\right] = h^{r_0}(A_j)^2\,.$$

Finally, note that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[0 \leftrightarrow r_0/2\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{W^c}\right]^2\right] = \mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[0 \leftrightarrow r_0/2\right] = \alpha_1(r_0/2)\,.$$

By spatial independence, we are done. (We could have treated the case where there are only centered annuli in $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ by very similar ideas but by using (2.9) from [GPS10] instead of Lemma B.2. It is actually easier than the above case.) □

Let $j \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$ and let ρ_j and ρ'_j be the inner and outer radii of A_j. It is not difficult to see that there exists a (upper, lower, left or right depending on j) half-plane H_j such that the center of A_j belongs to the boundary of H_j and $(-r_0, r_0)^2 \subseteq H_j$.

Note that for any $B_1 \subseteq B_2 \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$ and any function $h : \Omega_R \to \mathbb{R}$ we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_{B_1}\right]^2\right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_{B_2}\right]^2\right].$$

This implies that:

$$h^{r_0}(A_j)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[\text{4-arm event in } A_j \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{H}_j}\right]^2\right],$$

where $\mathbb{H}_j = H_j \cap \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{R}}$.

Together with Lemma C.1, it implies that there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and $C < +\infty$ such that:

$$h^{r_0}(A_j) \leq C\alpha_4(\rho_j, \rho'_j)\left(\frac{\rho'_j}{\rho_j}\right)^{-\epsilon}. \tag{5.4}$$

By possibly decreasing ϵ, we also assume the following technical condition: there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that, for all $\rho_2 \geq \rho_1 \geq 1$:

$$\left(\alpha_4(\rho_1, \rho_2)\left(\frac{\rho_2}{\rho_1}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\right)^{1.01}\left(\frac{\rho_2}{\rho_1}\right)^{-c} \geq c\left(\alpha_4(\rho_1, \rho_2)\frac{\rho_2}{\rho_1}\right)^2 \tag{5.5}$$

(we know that it is possible thanks to the right-hand-inequality of (2.7)). See Remark 5.6 below for an explanation about why we need (5.5).

We now write $h(\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}) = \prod_{A\in\mathcal{A}} h(A) \prod_{j\in\{1,\cdots,n\}} h^{r_0}(A_j)$. More generally, for any $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}' \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$, we write $h(\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}')$ for the obvious analogue where we only consider the annuli in $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}'$.

Let us fix $1 \leq r \leq r_0 \leq R/2$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ for the rest of the proof. Recall that for any $\theta < +\infty$, we defined in the statement of Proposition 5.3 $g(k) := 2^{\theta \log_2^2(k+2)}$. Thanks to Lemma 5.5, it is now sufficient to prove that there exists an absolute constant $\theta < +\infty$ such that, if $g(k)\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(r_0)}\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r, r_0) \leq 1$ (where ϵ is as in inequalities (5.4) and (5.5)), then there exists a set $\mathfrak{U}_k$ of r_0-decorated centered annulus structures such that: *(a)* for all S that satisfies $|S_r^{r_0}| = k$, there exists $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathfrak{U}_k$ compatible with S and *(b)*:

$$\sum_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}\in\mathfrak{U}_k} 4^{|\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}|}\,\alpha_1(r_0/2)\,h(\widetilde{\mathcal{A}})^2 \leq g(k)\frac{\alpha_1(R)^2}{\alpha_1(r_0)}\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r, r_0). \tag{5.6}$$

(If $g(k)\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(r_0)}\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r, r_0) > 1$ then (5.2) is trivial since $\alpha_1(R)$ is the total mass of $\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_{f_R}$.)

Remark 5.6. The reason why we need condition (5.5) on ϵ can be explained as follows: in the next paragraph, we will construct our sets of r_0-decorated centered annulus structures $\mathfrak{U}_k$. Then, we will estimate the quantities $\sum_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}\in\mathfrak{U}_k} 4^{|\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}|}\,\alpha_1(r_0/2)\,h(\widetilde{\mathcal{A}})^2$ of (5.6) by induction. At each step of the induction, the annuli centered on the boundary of $[-r_0, r_0]^2$ will induce estimates of the form $\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r, r_0)$ and the other interior annuli will induce estimates of the form $\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{2}\alpha_4(r, r_0)^2$. Since we will deal a lot with such terms, it is useful to know which of them is the dominant term, and that is why we assume in (5.5) that ϵ is sufficiently small so that $\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r, r_0) \geq O(1)\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\alpha_4(r, r_0)\right)^2$.

Actually, what we have assumed in (5.5) is even stronger. The reason why we need the existence of the exponents c (even very small) and 1.01 in (5.5) is that we will use these exponents so that we do not loose too much at each step of the induction. Actually, we could have chosen any number $1 + a \in (1, 2)$ instead of 1.01 and the proof would have been exactly the same by only replacing all the exponents 1.01 by $1 + a$ (in particular in the

estimate (5.8) below). The reason why we have chosen 1.01 is only that it is nice to think of a as being very small so that we can have precise estimates about the exponent ϵ that we are able to consider. See Remark 5.9 for more about this.

Let us end this remark by saying that at some point of the proof it will probably be more natural to work with an exponent $1+a$ close to 2 instead of 1.01 (in the same spirit as the exponent 1.99 that appears in Section 4 of [GPS10]) since the exponent will be extracted from a geometric sum of the form $\sum_{d=2}^{k'} \gamma^d$ (see for instance the proof of (5.8) below). With the above explanations, we hope that the fact that we have chosen $1+a = 1.01$ will not confuse the reader.

We now proceed to the construction of the sets $\mathfrak{U}_k$.

The construction of the r_0-decorated centered annulus structures In Section 4 of [GPS10], the authors explain how we can classify the annulus structures. We will follow the same ideas to classify our r_0-decorated centered annulus structures. Take $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$ such that $|S_r^{r_0}| = k$. For $j \in \mathbb{N}_+$, we define G_j as the graph with vertices the elements of $S_r^{r_0} \cup \{0\}$ and with edges present between any two points with Euclidean distance from one to the other at most $2^j r$ (say for instance that the distance between two sets is the infimum distance between these two sets - the fact that the vertices are squares except $\{0\}$ that is a point will not be a problem). For the case $j = 0$, G_j is simply the graph with vertices the elements of $S_r^{r_0} \cup \{0\}$ and with no edge. The authors of [GPS10] explain how to construct annuli around the connected components of the G_j's. Let us explain it (the difference will be that we will need to change the definition for annuli close to $\partial[-r_0, r_0]^2$):

Let $\bar{j} = \lfloor \log_2 \left(\frac{R}{kr}\right) \rfloor - 5$ and $J = \{0, \cdots, \bar{j}\}$. Take $j \in \{1, \cdots, \bar{j}\}$. A connected component of G_j is called an **interior cluster at level j** if it does not contain $\{0\}$, it is not a connected component of G_{j-1} and its distance to $\partial[-r_0, r_0]^2 \cup \partial[-R, R]^2$ is larger than $2^j r$. A connected component of G_j is a **centered cluster at level j** if it contains $\{0\}$ and it is not a connected component of G_{j-1}. We define by induction on $j \in \{1, \cdots, \bar{j}\}$ the other clusters: a connected component of G_j is a **side cluster at level j** if it is within distance $2^j r$ of precisely one of the boundary edges of $[-R, R]^2$ and it is not a side cluster at level j' for any $j' \in \{1, \cdots, j-1\}$. A connected component of G_j is a **corner cluster at level j** if it is within distance $2^j r$ of precisely two adjacent boundary edges of $[-R, R]^2$ and it is not a corner cluster at level j' for any $j' \in \{1, \cdots, j-1\}$. A connected component of G_j is a **r_0-cluster at level j** if it does not contain $\{0\}$, it is within distance $2^j r$ of $\partial[-r_0, r_0]^2$ and it is not a r_0-cluster at level j' for any $j' \in \{1, \cdots, j-1\}$. Furthermore, a connected component of G_0 (i.e. a singleton) that is not $\{\{0\}\}$ is an interior cluster at level 0 and the singleton $\{\{0\}\}$ is a centered cluster at level 0. Finally, we define a unique cluster at level $\bar{j}+1$ that is the entire set $S_r^{r_0} \cup \{0\}$ and is called the **top cluster**.

With these definitions, for any $j \in J$ and any connected component C of G_j, there exists $j' \in J$ such that C is a cluster at level j' of some of the types described above. Moreover, for any type of cluster there exists at most one level $j' \in J$ such that C is a cluster at level j' of this type and for any level $j' \in J$ there exists at most one type of cluster such that C is a cluster at level j' of this type. These properties are true because of the choice of $\bar{j}$ and the fact that $r_0 \leq R/2$.

For a cluster C of any type, we write $j(C)$ for the level of C.

We want to define a tree structure for our clusters. Let C be a cluster of some type at some level $j \in J$. The parent of C is either C itself if C is also a cluster of some other type at some level $j' > j$ (and we choose the smallest level j' if there are more than one choice) or the smallest cluster that properly contains C otherwise (and we also choose the smallest level $j' > j$). We write C^p for the parent of C. For instance, the children of a r_0-cluster can only be interior and r_0-clusters; moreover, a r_0-cluster at level $j > 0$ either has a single child that is an interior cluster or has at least two children.

Now, for any of the clusters C described above (except for the top cluster), we define an annulus A_C. The inner radius of this annulus will be $2^{j(C)+4}|C|$ and the outer radius

will be $2^{j(C^p)-4}$. The center will be 0 if C is a centered cluster and the corner associated to C if C is a corner cluster. In the other cases, we use some deterministic law to choose a vertex $v = v(C)$ of C and we choose the center of the annulus as follows: If C is an interior cluster, we decide that the center of A_C is the (or one of the) nearest point(s) of v whose coordinates are divided by $2^{j(C)}r$. If C is a side cluster, the center of A_C is the (or one of the) nearest point(s) of v that is on $\partial[-R,R]^2$ and whose coordinate that is not R is divided by $2^{j(C)}r$. We do exactly the same thing with r_0-clusters but now **we center the annulus on $\partial[-r_0, r_0]^2$**. (When the outer radius is larger than the inner radius, A_C is the empty annulus.)

There is only **one exception**: if C is the singleton $\{\{0\}\}$, we decide that the inner radius is $2^4 r \vee (r_0 + 2)$ instead of $2^4 r$ (and the outer radius is still $2^{j(C^p)-4}$).

All these annuli define a r_0-decorated centered annulus structure $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_1(S)$ compatible with S (to see this, write $A_1, \cdots, A_n$ for the annuli associated to the r_0-clusters). Let us for instance check that our the annuli associated to the r_0-clusters are percolation disjoint from $[-r_0/2, r_0/2]^2$. Let C be a r_0-cluster at level j. Some vertex of C is at distance less than or equal to $2^j r$ of $\partial[-r_0, r_0]^2$ and $\{0\} \notin C$, so $2^{j(C^p)} r \leq 2(\sqrt{2} r_0 + 2^j r)$ i.e. $2^{j(C^p)-4} r \leq r_0/2^{2,5} + 2^{j-3} r$. Therefore, if the annulus associated to C is not empty, then $2^{j+4} r \leq 2^{j+4} r|C| \leq 2^{j(C^p)-4} r \leq r_0/2^{2,5} + 2^{j-3} r$ so $2^{j-3} r \leq r_0/2^{8.5}$ and the outer radius is $2^{j(C^p)-4} < r_0/2^{2,5} + r_0/2^{8.5} \leq r_0/4$. So, if r_0 is sufficiently large (for instance if $r_0 \geq 8$) then the annulus is percolation disjoint from $[-r_0/2, r_0/2]^2$. If $r_0 < 8$, it is not difficult to see that with same arguments we obtain that any annulus associated to a r_0-cluster is empty.

For the other conditions that we have to check to prove that $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_1(S)$ is a r_0-decorated centered annulus structure compatible with S, we use similar arguments (see Section 4 of [GPS10] where the authors explain some similar results).

Actually, since we have defined these sets of annuli for every S such that $|S_r^{r_0}| = k$, we have defined too many different r_0-decorated centered annulus structures and that would make the sum in (5.6) much bigger than we would like (see Section 4 of [GPS10] for more about such a problem). So, we need a few other definitions. Consider four positive real numbers $+\infty > \theta > \theta^* > \theta^{r_0} > \theta' > 1$ that we will determine later. We define g', g^{r_0} and g^* like g but with θ', θ^{r_0} and θ^* instead of θ. We also define $\gamma_{\rho_1}(\rho_2) = \left(\frac{\rho_2}{\rho_1}\alpha_4(\rho_1,\rho_2)\right)^2$, $\gamma_{\rho_1}^{r_0}(\rho_2) = \left(\frac{\rho_2}{\rho_1}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(\rho_1,\rho_2)$ (where ϵ is the constant in (5.4) and (5.5)), $\gamma^*(\rho_1,\rho_2) = \alpha_1(\rho_1,\rho_2)^2$, $\overline{\gamma}_{\rho_1}(\rho_2) = \inf_{\rho' \in [1,\rho_2]} \gamma_{\rho_1}(\rho')$ and $\overline{\gamma}_{\rho_1}^{r_0}(\rho_2) = \inf_{\rho' \in [1,\rho_2]} \gamma_{\rho_1}^{r_0}(\rho')$. Note that:

$$\overline{\gamma}_{\rho_1}(\rho_2) \asymp \gamma_{\rho_1}(\rho_2)\,,$$

and similarly for $\overline{\gamma}^{r_0}$. (The quantities $\overline{\gamma}$ and $\overline{\gamma}^{r_0}$ are defined in order to work with decreasing functions in ρ_2, note that γ^* is already decreasing in ρ_2).

Now, if C is an interior, side or corner cluster then we say that C is **overcrowded** if we have $g'(|C|)\overline{\gamma}_r(2^{j(C)}r) > 1$. If C is a r_0-cluster then we say that C is overcrowded if $g^{r_0}(|C|)\overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^{j(C)}r) > 1$. Finally, if C is centered then we say that C is overcrowded if $g^*(|C|)\gamma_{r_0}^*(2^{j(C)}r)\,\overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^{j(C)}r) > 1$. (Note that all clusters at level 0 are overcrowded.) We define a r_0-decorated centered annulus structure $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(S)$ by removing from $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_1(S)$ every annulus that corresponds to a proper descendent of an overcrowded cluster. The r_0-decorated centered annulus structure $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(S)$ is still compatible with S and we can define:

$$\mathfrak{U}_k = \left\{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(S) : S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R \text{ such that } |S_r^{r_0}| = k\right\}.$$

Note that from the definition of the r_0-decorated centered annulus structures and from the construction above, we have the following: Let $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$ be such that $|S_r^{r_0}| = k$. Let $A_1, \cdots, A_n$ be the annuli associated to the r_0-clusters of S and that have not been removed from $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_1(S)$. Also, let $\mathcal{A}(S) = \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(S) \setminus \{A_1, \cdots, A_n\}$. Then:

$$h(\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(S))^2 = \prod_{j=1}^{n} h^{r_0}(A_j)^2 \prod_{A\in\mathcal{A}(S)} h(A)^2 \,.$$

Some estimates proved inductively The strategy is to prove some estimates inductively and then conclude thanks to these estimates. Remember that we want to prove (5.6). We need a few last notations (remember that we have fixed r, R and k). For C a cluster coming from some S such that $|S_r^{r_0}| = k$, let $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}'(C)$ denote the subset of $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(S)$ corresponding to the proper descendents of C.

Take $k' \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $j \in J$. Let B be a square such that there exists an interior cluster C (of some $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$ that satisfies $|S_r^{r_0}| = k$) such that the level of C is j, $|C| = k'$ and B is the inner square of the annulus associated to C. We also ask that the annulus has not been removed (i.e. we ask that C is not a proper descendant of an overcrowded cluster). (However, the annulus of C can be empty.) We define:

$$\mathfrak{U}^{int}(B,k',j) = \left\{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}'(C) : C \text{ as above}\right\}$$

and:

$$H^{int}(j,k') = \sup_{B \text{ as above}} \sum_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}'\in\mathfrak{U}^{int}(B,k',j)} 4^{|\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}'|}\, h(\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}')^2 \,.$$

We do exactly the same thing for centered, side, corner and r_0-clusters and define respectively $H^*(j,k')$, $H^+(j,k')$, $H^{++}(j,k')$ and $H^{r_0}(j,k')$ (if there is no such B then the supremum is 0).

We want to show by induction on j that, if θ', θ^{r_0}/θ' and θ^*/θ^{r_0} are sufficiently large, then the following inequalities hold for any $j \in J$ and $k' \in \mathbb{N}_+$:

$$\forall \text{ symbol } \natural \in \{int, +, ++\}, H^\natural(j,k') \le g'(k')\,\overline{\gamma}_r(2^j r)\,, \tag{5.7}$$

$$H^{r_0}(j,k') \le \left(g^{r_0}(k')\,\overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^j r)\right)^{1.01}\,, \tag{5.8}$$

$$H^*(j,k') \le g^*(k')\,\gamma_{r_0}^*(2^j r)\,\overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^j r)\,. \tag{5.9}$$

First, note that if $j \le J'(k') := \max\{j \in \mathbb{N} : g'(k')\overline{\gamma}_r(2^j r) > 1\}$ then inequalities (5.7) are trivially true, if $j \le J^{r_0}(k') := \max\{j \in \mathbb{N} : g^{r_0}(k')\,\overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^j r) > 1\}$ then it is the case for inequality (5.8) and if $j \le J^*(k') := \max\{j \in \mathbb{N} : g^*(k')\gamma_{r_0}^*(2^j r)\,\overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^j r) > 1\}$ then it is the case for (5.9).

Remark 5.7. Inequalities (5.7), (5.8) and (5.9) are still true if we raise the right-hand-side to any power in $[0,1]$ (distinguish between the two cases $j \le J^\natural(k')$ and $j > J^\natural(k')$ for all symbols $\natural$). For instance, we will also use (5.8) with exponent 1 instead of 1.01.

Remark 5.8. Until the end of proof, we will often use the quasi-multiplicativity property and (2.1) without specifying it. We will also use that for any j_0 and any $a > 0$:

$$\sum_{j'\ge j_0} \overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^{j'} r)^a \asymp \overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^{j_0} r)^a$$

(where the constant in $\asymp$ may only depend on a). Of course, the similar properties are also true for γ^* and $\overline{\gamma}$.

The estimates (5.7) are proved in Section 4 of [GPS10] (actually, in [GPS10] there is not the $4^{|\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}'|}$ term in the definition of the H's but that does not change the computation since at each step the factors 4 corresponding to the annuli we add are absorbed in the other $O(1)$ terms). Note that in these estimates neither r_0-clusters nor centered clusters play a role since the descendents of interior, side and corner clusters cannot be neither centered nor r_0-clusters. The idea of the proof of (5.8) is similar. Let us say more about this last result. We proceed by induction on j. If $j = 0$ and $k' \in \mathbb{N}_+$ then we are done (and more generally if

$j \leq J^{r_0}(k')$). We take some $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k' \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $j > J^{r_0}(k')$, we assume that (5.8) is true for every (k'', j') with $k'' \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $j' \in \{0, \cdots, j-1\}$ and we want to prove it for (k', j).

Consider some B as in the definition of $H^{r_0}(j, k')$ (if there is no such B then we are done since in this case $H^{r_0}(j, k') = 0$). The square B is the inner square of the annulus associated to some r_0-cluster C at level j such that $|C| = k'$. Let $C_1, \cdots, C_d$ be the children of C, let $A_{C_1}, \cdots, A_{C_d}$ be the annuli associated to $C_1, \cdots, C_d$ and let $B_1, \cdots, B_d$ be the inner squares of these annuli. Note that either $d = 1$ and C_1 is an interior cluster or $d \geq 2$ and the C_i's are either interior or r_0-clusters. Moreover, if we know that C_i is an interior (respectively r_0-) cluster at level j_i, then there are at most $O(1)\,(k' 2^j r/(2^{j_i} r))^2 = O(1)\,(k' 2^{j-j_i})^2$ (respectively $O(1)\,k' 2^j r/(2^{j_i} r) = O(1)\,k' 2^{j-j_i}$) possible choices for B_i. Furthermore, if k_i is the cardinal of C_i then the inner radius of A_{C_i} is $k_i 2^{j_i+4} r$ and its outer radius is $2^{j-4} r$. Hence, if C_i is an interior cluster, then $h(A_{C_i})^2 = \alpha_4(k_i 2^{j_i+4} r, 2^{j-4} r)^2$. Moreover, (5.4) implies that if C_i is a r_0-cluster then we have $h^{r_0}(A_{C_i})^2 \leq O(1)\,\alpha_4(k_i 2^{j_i+4} r, 2^{j-4} r)\,\left(2^{j-4} r/(k_i 2^{j_i+4} r)\right)^{-\epsilon}$.

If we distinguish between the cases $d = 1$ and $d \geq 2$, we obtain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
H^{r_0}(j, k') \leq\; & O(1) \sum_{j_1 < j} (k' 2^{j-j_1})^2\, \alpha_4(k' 2^{j_1+4} r, 2^{j-4} r)^2\, H^{int}(j_1, k') \\
& + \sum_{d=2}^{k'} \sum_{j_1, \cdots, j_d < j} \sum_{\substack{k_1, \cdots, k_d \in \mathbb{N}_+ : \\ k_1 + \cdots + k_d = k'}} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \Bigg(O(1)\,(k' 2^{j-j_i})^2\, \alpha_4(k_i 2^{j_i+4} r, 2^{j-4} r)^2\, H^{int}(j_i, k_i) \\
& + O(1)\, k' 2^{j-j_i}\, \alpha_4(k_i 2^{j_i+4} r, 2^{j-4} r)\, \left(\frac{2^{j-4} r}{k_i 2^{j_i+4} r} \right)^{-\epsilon} H^{r_0}(j_i, k_i) \Bigg) .
\end{aligned}
$$

As explained in Section 4 of [GPS10] where the authors deal with quantities analogous to our H, H^+ and H^{++}, we can conclude thanks to the induction hypothesis and the quasi-multiplicativity property. More precisely, what helps us when dealing with the first sum above is (5.5) and the fact that θ^{r_0}/θ' can be chosen as large as we want (in [GPS10], the authors use similar ideas for instance to deal with the fact that a corner cluster may have a single child which is an interior cluster). For the second sum, if θ^{r_0}/θ' is sufficiently large (and by (5.5)), our estimates about the terms coming from r_0-clusters are dominant. Finally, we can conclude by using the induction hypothesis with exponent 1 instead of 1.01 and what saves us is that $d \geq 2$.

For more details about similar calculations, we refer to [GPS10]. See also below where the case of H^* is more detailed.

Now, let us prove (5.9). Take $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k' \in \mathbb{N}_+$. First note that we can take $h \in (0, 1/4)$ such that, for all $1 \leq \rho_1 \leq \rho_2$:

$$
\overline{\gamma}^{r_0}_{\rho_1}(\rho_2)^{1-2h} \leq \frac{1}{h} \gamma^*_{\rho_1}(\rho_2)^h .
$$

Consider some B as in the definition of $H^*(j, k')$. The square B is the inner square of the annulus associated to some centered cluster C at level j with $|C| = k'$. If $j = 0$ and $k' \in \mathbb{N}_+$ then we are done (and more generally if $j \leq J^*(k')$). We take some $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $k' \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $j > J^*(k')$ and we prove the result by induction on j. Let $C_1, \cdots, C_d$ be the children of C. Note that $d \geq 2$ and that exactly one of the C_i's is centered, say that it is C_1. Remember Remark 5.7: the induction hypothesis implies that the following is true for any $k'' \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $j' \in \{0, \cdots, j-1\}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
H^*(j', k'') &\leq \left(g^*(k'')\, \gamma^*_{r_0}(2^{j'} r)\, \overline{\gamma}^{r_0}_r(2^{j'} r) \right)^{1-h} \\
&\leq g^*(k'')^{1-h}\, \gamma^*_{r_0}(2^{j'} r)^{1-h}\, \overline{\gamma}^{r_0}_r(2^{j'} r)^{1-2h}\, \overline{\gamma}^{r_0}_r(2^{j'} r)^h \\
&\leq g^*(k'')^{1-h}\, \frac{1}{h} \gamma^*_{r_0}(2^{j'} r)\, \overline{\gamma}^{r_0}_r(2^{j'} r)^h . \qquad (5.10)
\end{aligned}
$$

(In the last line we have used that $r \le r_0$.) Note that for $i \ge 2$, C_i can be either an interior cluster or r_0-cluster. As above, our estimates on the r_0-clusters will dominate the estimates on the interior clusters. Let us also recall that the way to associate an annulus to the singleton $\{\{0\}\}$ is different from the other clusters, that is why "$\vee(r_0+2)$" appears in the estimate below. We have:

$$H^*(j,k') \le \sum_{d=2}^{k'} \sum_{j_1,\cdots,j_d<j} \sum_{\substack{k_1,\cdots,k_d\in\mathbb{N}_+:\\ k_1+\cdots+k_d=k'}} O(1)\ \alpha_1\left((k_1 2^{j_1+4} r)\vee(r_0+2), 2^{j-4}r\right)^2\ H^*(j_1,k_1)$$
$$\times \prod_{i=2}^{d} \left(O(1)\, k'\, 2^{j-j_i}\ \alpha_4(k_i 2^{j_i+4}r, 2^{j-4}r)\ \left(\frac{2^{j-4}r}{k_i 2^{j_i+4}r}\right)^{-\epsilon}\ \left(g^{r_0}(k_i)\,\overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^{j_i}r)\right)^{1.01}\right)$$

(the term $\left(g^{r_0}(k_i)\,\overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^{j_i}r)\right)^{1.01}$ comes from (5.8)).

We continue the calculation: by using (5.10) to deal with $H^*(j_1,k_1)$ (and also the fact that $\alpha_1\left((k_1 2^{j_1+4}r)\vee(r_0+2), 2^{j-4}r\right)^2\ \gamma^*_{r_0}(2^{j_1}r) \le O(1)\, k_1^{O(1)} \gamma^*_{r_0}(2^j r)$ and similar estimates for the other quantities) we find that the above is at most:

$$\sum_{d=2}^{k'} \sum_{j_1,\cdots,j_d<j} \sum_{\substack{k_1,\cdots,k_d\in\mathbb{N}_+:\\ k_1+\cdots+k_d=k'}} O(1)\, k_1^{O(1)}\, g^*(k_1)^{1-h}\, \frac{1}{h}\, \gamma^*_{r_0}(2^j r)\, \overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^{j_1}r)^h$$
$$\times \prod_{i=2}^{d} \left(O(1)\, k'^{O(1)}\, g^{r_0}(k_i)^{1.01}\, \overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^j r)\, \overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^{j_i}r)^{0.01}\right)$$
$$\le \gamma^*_{r_0}(2^j r)\, g^*(k')^{1-h} \sum_{d=2}^{k'} \left(\sum_{j_1\in\mathbb{N}} \overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^{j_1}r)^h \right)$$
$$\times \sum_{\substack{k_1,\cdots,k_d\in\mathbb{N}_+:\\ k_1+\cdots+k_d=k'}} \prod_{i=2}^{d} \left(O(1)\, k'^{O(1)}\, g^{r_0}(k_i)^{1.01} \overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^j r) \sum_{j'\in\mathbb{N}} \overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^{j'}r)^{0.01}\right)$$
$$\le \gamma^*_{r_0}(2^j r) g^*(k')^{1-h} \sum_{d=2}^{k'} \left(O(1)\, k'^{O(1)}\, g^{r_0}(k')^{1.01}\, \overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^j r)\right)^{d-1}.$$

If θ^*/θ^{r_0} is sufficiently large, then the hypothesis $j > J^*(k')$ implies that:

$$O(1)\, k'^{O(1)}\, g^{r_0}(k')^{1.01}\, \overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^j r) \le \left(\frac{1}{2} g^*(k')^h\, \overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^j r)\right) \wedge \frac{1}{2}$$

and the last line is smaller than or equal to:

$$\gamma^*_{r_0}(2^j r)\, g^*(k')\, \overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^j r)\,.$$

End of the proof All that remains is to prove that (5.7), (5.8) and (5.9) imply Proposition 5.3 if θ is sufficiently large. Remember that it is sufficient to prove (5.6). Thanks to the quasi-multiplicativity property (and with possibly another choice for θ) it is equivalent to the fact that the following holds for any j such that $g(k)\,\alpha_1(r_0, 2^{\bar{j}}r)\,\overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^{\bar{j}}r) \le 1$:

$$\sum_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}\in\mathfrak{U}_k} 4^{|\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}|}\, h(\widetilde{\mathcal{A}})^2 \le g(k)\, \gamma^*_{r_0}(2^{\bar{j}}r)\, \overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(r_0)\,.$$

Let C be the top cluster of some S such that $|S_r^{r_0}| = k$. Let $C_1,\cdots,C_d$ be the children of C. Note that exactly one of the C_i's is centered, say that it is C_1. The other C_i's can be of any type (and d may equal 1). As above (and thanks to (2.6)), our estimates on the r_0-clusters will dominate the estimates on the interior, side and corner clusters. Note also that,

if $d=1$, then C_1 contains $\{0\}$ and also at least one $r\times r$ square not included in $(-r_0,r_0)^2$, so $\log_2(r_0/(2r))\le j(C_1)$. We have (the terms $k+1$ and k_1+1 only come from the fact that $|C|=|S_r^{r_0}\cup\{0\}|=k+1$):

$$\sum_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}\in\mathfrak{U}_k} 4^{|\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}|}\,h(\widetilde{\mathcal{A}})^2 \le \sum_{\log_2(r_0/(2r))\le j_1\le\bar{j}} \left(\alpha_1((k+1)2^{j_1+4}r, 2^{\bar{j}+1-4})^2\,H^*(j_1,k+1)\right)$$
$$+\sum_{d=2}^{k}\sum_{\substack{k_1,\cdots,k_d:\\ k_1+\cdots+k_d=k}}\sum_{j_1,\cdots,j_d\le\bar{j}} \left(\alpha_1\left(((k_1+1)2^{j_1+4}r)\vee(r_0+2), 2^{\bar{j}+1-4}\right)^2 H^*(j_1,k_1+1)\right.$$
$$\left.\times\prod_{i=2}^{d}\left(O(1)\,k^{O(1)}\,\frac{R}{2^{j_i}r}\,\alpha_4(k_i2^{j_i+4}r, 2^{\bar{j}+1-4})\left(\frac{2^{\bar{j}+1-4}}{k_i2^{j_i+4}}\right)^{-\epsilon}\left(g^{r_0}(k_i)\,\overline{\gamma}_r^{r_0}(2^{j_i}r)\right)^{1.01}\right)\right).$$

Now, the calculations are not very different from the calculations in Section 4 of [GPS10] or the calculations in the case of H^* detailed above. That ends the proof of (5.6) and therefore of Proposition 5.3. □

5.2.2 The proof of Theorem 2.8

We now combine Propositions 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 in order to prove Theorem 2.8.

Proof of Theorem 2.8. The proof is very similar to the proof of Theorem 7.3 of [GPS10] (which is Theorem 2.5 in our paper). Consequently, we will leave some details to the reader. The main difference is that we have to use Proposition 5.3 instead of the estimate (5.1).

Note that we can assume that $r\ge\overline{r}$ for some absolute constant $\overline{r}$ (if $r<\overline{r}$ then Theorem 2.8 is a direct consequence of Proposition 5.3 applied itself with $r=1$ since $|S_1^{r_0}|\asymp|S\setminus(-r_0,r_0)^2|$). Let $(B_i)_i$ be a tiling of the annulus $[-(R+2),R+2]^2\setminus(-r_0,r_0)^2$ by $l_i\times l_i'$ rectangles with $r\le l_i,\,l_i'\le 2r$ for every i (for instance, we can tile with $r\times r$ squares expect near $\partial[-(R+2),(R+2)]^2$ where we use rectangles so that we perfectly tile the annulus). Also, let $\mathcal{S}=\mathcal{S}_{f_R}$ be a spectral sample of f_R and $\mathcal{Z}=\mathcal{Z}_r$ be a random subset of $\{i\in\mathcal{I}_R\,:\,i\notin(-r_0,r_0)^2\}$ that is independent of $\mathcal{S}_{f_R}$, where each element of $\{i\in\mathcal{I}_R\,:\,i\notin(-r_0,r_0)^2\}$ is in $\mathcal{Z}$ with probability $\frac{1}{r^2\alpha_4(r)}$ independently of the others.

It is sufficient to prove that (for some $\epsilon>0$ and $C<+\infty$):

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mathcal{S}\cap\mathcal{Z}=\emptyset\ne\mathcal{S}\setminus(-r_0,r_0)^2\right]\le C\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(r_0)}\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r,r_0)\,.$$

We first assume that $r<r_0/4$. Let x_i be the indicator function of $\{\mathcal{S}\cap B_i\ne\emptyset\}$ and y_i the indicator function of $\{\mathcal{S}\cap B_i\cap\mathcal{Z}\ne\emptyset\}$. Let X and Y be as in Proposition 5.2. The hypothesis of Proposition 5.2 is given by Proposition 5.1. We will also use that $\frac{1}{C_1}|\mathcal{S}_r^{r_0}|\le X\le C_1|\mathcal{S}_r^{r_0}|$ for some absolute constant $C_1\in(0,+\infty)$. By using Proposition 5.2 and then Proposition 5.3 we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left[\mathcal{S}\cap\mathcal{Z}=\emptyset\ne\mathcal{S}\setminus(-r_0,r_0)^2\right] &= \mathbb{P}\left[Y=0<X\right]\\
&\le \frac{1}{a}\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-aX/e)\mathbb{1}_{X>0}\right]\\
&\le \frac{1}{a}\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-a|\mathcal{S}_r^{r_0}|/(C_1e))\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}_r^{r_0}\ne\emptyset}\right]\\
&\le \frac{1}{a}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_+}\exp(-ak/(C_1e))\,g(k)\,\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(r_0)}\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r,r_0)\\
&= C_2\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(r_0)}\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\alpha_4(r,r_0)\,,
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_2<+\infty$ since g is sub-exponential.

We now assume that $r \geq r_0/4$. We keep the notations X and Y. The problem is that we cannot use Proposition 5.1 for the rectangles B_i that intersect $[-4r,4r]^2$. However, the number of such rectangles is at most 100. We write $J = \{i : B_i \text{ does not intersect} [-4r,4r]^2\}$, $\widetilde{X} = \sum_{i \notin J} x_i$ and $\widetilde{Y} = \sum_{i \notin J} y_i$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{Z} = \emptyset \neq \mathcal{S} \setminus (-r_0,r_0)^2\right] &= \mathbb{P}\left[Y = 0 < X\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[0 < X \leq 100\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[\widetilde{Y} = 0 < \widetilde{X}\right] . \end{aligned}$$

By using Proposition 5.2 for $\widetilde{X}$ and $\widetilde{Y}$, we obtain that the above is at most:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left[0 < X \leq 100\right] + \frac{1}{a}\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-a\widetilde{X}/e)\mathbb{1}_{\widetilde{X}>0}\right] \\ &\qquad \leq \mathbb{P}\left[0 < X \leq 100\right] + \frac{1}{a}\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-a(X-100)/e)\mathbb{1}_{X>0}\right] . \end{aligned}$$

We now conclude as in the case $r < r_0/4$, i.e. by using the fact that $X \asymp |S_r^{r_0}|$ and Proposition 5.3. □

Remark 5.9. In this remark, we try to be more quantitative about the ϵ of Theorem 2.8 in the case of site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$.

As pointed out in Remark 5.6, we can replace all the exponents 1.01 that appear in the proof of Proposition 5.3 by $1+a$ for any $a \in (0,1)$. Now, remember that the conditions about ϵ were that (5.5) is satisfied and that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[\mathbf{A}_4(r_1,r_2) \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{H}}\right]^2\right] \leq O(1)\ \alpha_4(r_1,r_2)\ \left(\frac{r_2}{r_1}\right)^{-\epsilon} ,$$

where $\mathbf{A}_4(r_1,r_2)$ is the 4-arm event in the annulus $[-r_2,r_2] \setminus (-r_1,r_1)^2$ and $\mathbb{H}$ is the (lower, upper, left or right) half-plane. In the case of site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$, this last condition holds for any $\epsilon < -5/4 + \zeta_4^{|\mathbb{H}}$ (see Proposition C.2). Finally, by combining this with (5.5), we obtain that Proposition 5.3 is true for any $\epsilon < (-5/4 + \zeta_4^{|\mathbb{H}}) \wedge 1/4$. Consequently, this is also the case for Theorem 2.8.

Remark 5.10. The fact that we had to deal with $|S_r^{r_0}|$ instead of $|S_r|$ in Proposition 5.3 **is a new difficulty** (compared to the proof of (5.1) in Section 4 of [GPS10]) and it is the reason why we had to introduce the r_0-decorated centered annulus structures and deal with the "4-arm event conditioned on a half-plane". Now, imagine we wanted to deal with Conjecture 6.1 (stated below) instead of Theorem 2.8. Then, we would have to consider the whole spectral sample so we would not need the notion of r_0-decorated centered annulus structures any more but only the notion of centered annulus structures of [GPS10]. Let us be more precise: If we follow [GPS10] (Subsection 4.4) with another choice for the definition of overcroweded centered clusters (a centered cluster would be overcrowded if $\gamma_r^*(2^{j(C)}r)g^*(|C|)\overline{\gamma}_r(2^{j(C)}r) > 1$) then we would obtain the following:

There exists some $\theta < +\infty$ such that, if for $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$ we write S_r for the set of squares of the grid $r\mathbb{Z}^2$ that intersect S, then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and for all $1 \leq r \leq r_0 \leq R/2$:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S_r| = k,\ S \not\subseteq (-r_0,r_0)^2\right] \leq g(k)\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(r)}\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\alpha_4(r,r_0)\right)^2 ,$$

where $g(k) = 2^{\theta \log_2^2(k+2)}$.

With this result, it seems that we can prove Conjecture 6.1 exactly as we proved Theorem 2.8 i.e. by using Propositions 5.1 and 5.2. Here, x_i would be the indicator functions of the event $\left\{\mathcal{S}_{f_R} \cap B_i \neq \emptyset\,,\ S \not\subseteq (-r_0,r_0)^2\right\}$ and y_i the indicator function of the event $\left\{\mathcal{S}_{f_R} \cap B_i \cap \mathcal{Z} \neq \emptyset\,,\ S \not\subseteq (-r_0,r_0)^2\right\}$. However, this strategy does not work since the event $\left\{S \not\subseteq (-r_0,r_0)^2\right\}$ represents some **positive information** when we look at the rectangles B_i

that are included in $(-r_0, r_0)^2$. Therefore, Proposition 5.1 does not give us the hypothesis we need to use Proposition 5.2 any more. So, in order to prove Conjecture 6.1, we would like to have an analogue of Proposition 5.1 where in the conditioning we can add $\{S \not\subseteq (-r_0, r_0)^2\}$. Techniques from [GPS10] are not suitable for such a conditioning, which explains why we cannot prove at the moment the better upper-bound given by Conjecture 6.1.

6 Open questions

Here is a list of a few open problems.

1. **Asymmetric exclusion dynamics.** Our hypothesis that the underlying exclusion dynamics is symmetric (i.e. K is symmetric) is crucial in our proofs. Indeed the duality formula (2.11) is no longer valid in the asymmetric setting. A natural question is thus to ask whether the results of the present article still hold by relaxing the symmetry condition.

2. **Handling more local dynamics.** Our techniques brake when α becomes too large (the best value of α can be found in equation (4.10)). The most extreme (and most interesting) case would be the nearest-neighbour simple exclusion process. We are very far at this point of being able to prove the existence of exceptional times in this case.

3. **Sharp clustering effect for the radial spectral sample.** In the proof of Corollary 2.9 (which is our key estimate in Theorem 1.5), we used the crude upper-bound:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S| < r^2\alpha_4(r), S \not\subseteq (-r_0, r_0)^2\right] \leq \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[0 < |S \setminus (-r_0, r_0)^2| < r^2\alpha_4(r)\right].$$

   We believe we have lost a lot in this inequality and we make the following conjecture (see Remark 5.10):

   Conjecture 6.1. *There exists a constant $C < +\infty$ such that, for all $1 \leq r \leq r_0$ and all $R \geq 1$:*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S| < r^2\alpha_4(r),\ S \not\subseteq (-r_0, r_0)^2\right] \leq C\frac{\alpha_1(R)}{\alpha_1(r)}\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\alpha_4(r, r_0)\right)^2.$$

   Note that if we had proved this conjecture then we would have obtained a bigger α_0 in Theorem 1.5.

4. **Clustering effect for left-right crossing events.** One of the main side technical contributions of this paper is our clustering result Theorem 2.8. Even though it does not give a sharp estimate on $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}\left[|S| < r^2\alpha_4(r), S \not\subseteq (-r_0, r_0)^2\right]$ as discussed in the item above, it provides the first polynomial clustering estimate on the spectral sample of the one-arm event f_R. Indeed, such a *clustering effect* had already been analysed in [GPS10], but it only gave rather weak (logarithmic) bounds. See Remark 4.5 in [GPS10]. Now, if g_n is the indicator function of the left-right crossing of $[-n, n]^2$, a similar polynomial clustering effect should hold as $n \to +\infty$. More precisely, the following analogue of Conjecture 6.1 for the functions g_n should hold:

   Conjecture 6.2. *There exists a constant $C < +\infty$ such that, for all $1 \leq r \leq r_0$ and all $n \geq 1$:*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{g_n}\left[|S| < r^2\alpha_4(r),\ \mathit{diam}(S) \geq r_0\right] \leq C\left(\frac{n}{r}\alpha_4(r, n)\right)^2\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\alpha_4(r, r_0)\right)^2.$$

   Somewhat surprisingly, it turns out to be easier for such clustering effects to deal with degenerate Boolean functions such as f_R rather than left-right crossing events g_n. This is due to the fact that we know in the case of $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{f_R}$ that the spectral sample will most likely localize in a ball centered at the origin. The additional flexibility corresponding to where in $[-n, n]^2$ the spectral sample of g_n will choose to localize adds new difficulties.

A Appendix: graphical construction (à la Harris) of Exclusion dynamics

In this appendix, we give a proper graphical construction of the Exclusion dynamics we need. It is in the spirit of the graphical constructions of particle systems initiated by Harris, see for example [Har78]. The content of this appendix is very basic and will probably be considered "folklore" by specialists. Yet, as we could not localize a reference, we include it here.

Let us then define properly the K-exclusion process, for instance for dynamics on the edges of a graph $G = (V, E)$. First, we sample a percolation configuration $\omega_K(0)$ according to some probability law. Next, to each pair $\{e, f\}$ of edges, we associate an exponential clock of parameter $K(e, f) = K(f, e)$ (independent of the others and $\omega_K(0)$). We define the càdlàg process $(\omega_K(t))_{t\geq 0}$ on the space $\Omega := \{-1, 1\}^E$ (seen as the compact metric product space) as follows:

1. First, we want to define a (random) dynamical permutation of E. Take $e \in E$. Let $\tau_1(e)$ be the first time a clock associated to e (i.e. the clock associated to $\{e, f\}$ for some edge f) has rung and let e_1 be the other edge associated to this clock. Define recursively $\tau_{n+1}(e)$ to be the first time larger than $\tau_n(e)$ such that a clock associated to e_n has rung and let e_{n+1} be the other edge associated to this clock. Now, for each $t \geq 0$, let $n_t(e) = \sup\{n : \tau_n(e) \leq t\}$ (with $\sup \emptyset = 0$) and let π_t be the (random) permutation of E defined by:
$$\pi_t(e) = e_{n_t(e)} \tag{A.1}$$
(with $e_0 := e$).
Note that a.s., for all t and e, $\pi_t(e)$ is well defined since a.s. for all t and all e:
   (a) there exists at most one edge e' such that the clock associated to $\{e, e'\}$ has rung at time t,
   (b) $n_t(e)$ is finite.

   Let us prove that a.s. π_t is indeed a permutation:
2. To this purpose, we define a function that will turn out to be the reciprocal function of π_t. For this, we follow the same steps as for the definition of π_t but we start from time t and look back in time. More precisely, if e is some edge, we denote by $\widehat{\tau}_1(e)$ the largest time less than or equal to t such that a clock associated to e has rung. If such a time does not exist, we write $\widehat{\tau}_1(e) = -\infty$. Otherwise, we write $\widehat{e}_1$ for the other edge associated to this clock. Then, recursively, if $\widehat{\tau}_n(e) \neq -\infty$, we write $\widehat{\tau}_{n+1}(e)$ for the larger time less than $\widehat{\tau}_n(e)$ such that a clock associated to $\widehat{e}_n$ has rung. If such a time does not exist, we write $\widehat{\tau}_{n+1}(e) = -\infty$. Otherwise, we write $\widehat{e}_{n+1}$ for the other edge associated to the clock. Let $\widehat{n}_t(e)$ be the first $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $\widehat{\tau}_k(e) = -\infty$. It is not difficult to show that a.s. for all t the function $e \mapsto \widehat{e}_{\widehat{n}_t(e)-1}$ (with $\widehat{e}_0 := e$) is well defined and is the reciprocal function of π_t.
3. Now, we can define $\omega_K(t)$ stating that the state of the edge $\pi_t(e)$ at time t is the state of the edge e at time 0. In other words, the configuration at time t is:
$$\omega_K(t) : e \longmapsto \omega(0)_{\pi_t^{-1}(e)}\,.$$

Using item 2 above (that defines explicitly $\pi_t^{-1}(e)$), it is not difficult to show that we have obtained a càdlàg Markov process and that the probability measures $\mathbb{P}_p$ are invariant.

B Appendix: a general property about the spectral sample

We need a general property about the links between the pivotals set and the spectral sample.

Definition B.1. Consider I a finite set (that we will call the "set of bits") and some $h : \{-1,1\}^I \to \mathbb{R}$. Let $J \subseteq I$ and let $J_1, \cdots, J_n$ be mutually disjoint subsets of I. We say that J is **pivotal** for h and some configuration ω if changing the values of the bits in J can change the value of h. We say that $J_1, \cdots, J_n$ are **jointly pivotal** for h and some configuration ω if, for every $j \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$, there is a choice of configuration in $\cup_{i \neq j} J_i$ making J_j pivotal. We will write $(\textit{Jointly Pivotal})_{J_1,\cdots,J_n}(h) = JP_{J_1,\cdots,J_n}(h)$ for the event $\{J_1, \cdots, J_n$ are jointly pivotal for $h\}$ (which is measurable with respect to the values of the bits outside $\cup_i J_i$).

Lemma B.2. *Consider I and h as above. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and let $J_1, \cdots, J_n, W$ be mutually disjoint subsets of I. Then:*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_h \left[\forall i, S \cap J_i \neq \emptyset\,,\, S \cap W = \emptyset\right] \leq 4^n \parallel h \parallel_\infty^2 \mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[JP_{J_1,\cdots,J_n}(h) \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_{W^c}\right]^2\right],$$

where, for $B \subseteq \mathcal{I}_R$, $\mathcal{F}_B$ is the σ-field of subsets of $\{-1,1\}^I$ generated by the restriction of ω to the bits in B. (Of course, the definitions of the Fourier decomposition and the spectral sample are the same with any finite set I instead of our sets $\mathcal{I}_R$ - i.e. with $\{-1,1\}^I$ instead of Ω_R and where $\mathbb{P}_{1/2}$ is the uniform measure on $\{-1,1\}^I$.)

Proof. First, we prove by induction on n that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_h \left[\forall i, S \cap J_i \neq \emptyset\,,\, S \cap W = \emptyset\right] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n} (-1)^k \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \ldots < j_k \leq n} \mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^k J_{j_i} \cup W\right)^c}\right]^2\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

If $n = 1$ this is in the proof of Lemma 2.2 of [GPS10]. We will also follow the proof of this last lemma for $n \geq 2$. Take $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and assume that the result is true for any $J_1', \cdots, J_n'$ and W' mutually disjoint subsets of I. Let $J_1, \cdots, J_{n+1}$ and W be mutually disjoint subsets of I. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}&\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_h \left[\forall i \in \{1, \cdots, n+1\}, S \cap J_i \neq \emptyset\,,\, S \cap W = \emptyset\right] \\ &= \widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_h \left[\forall i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}, S \cap J_i \neq \emptyset\,,\, S \cap W = \emptyset\right] \\ &- \widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_h \left[\forall i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}, S \cap J_i \neq \emptyset\,,\, S \cap (W \cup J_{n+1}) = \emptyset\right] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n} (-1)^k \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \ldots < j_k \leq n} \mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^k J_{j_i} \cup W\right)^c}\right]^2\right] \\ &- \sum_{k=0}^{n} (-1)^k \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \ldots < j_k \leq n} \mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^k J_{j_i} \cup J_{n+1} \cup W\right)^c}\right]^2\right] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n+1} (-1)^k \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \ldots < j_k \leq n+1} \mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^k J_{j_i} \cup W\right)^c}\right]^2\right], \end{aligned}$$

and the induction is over.

Now, we prove Lemma B.2, also by induction on n.

If $n = 1$ this is Lemma 2.2 of [GPS10]. We assume that Lemma B.2 holds for some $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and we want to prove it for $n+1$. Thanks to (B.1), it is sufficient to study the quantity $\sum_{k=0}^{n+1}(-1)^k \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \ldots < j_k \leq n+1} \mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^k J_{j_i} \cup W\right)^c}\right]^2\right]$, which equals:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=0}^{n} (-1)^k \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \ldots < j_k \leq n} \Bigg(&\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^k J_{j_i} \cup W\right)^c}\right]^2\right] \\ &- \mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^k J_{j_i} \cup J_{n+1} \cup W\right)^c}\right]^2\right]\Bigg).\end{aligned}$$

Note that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^{k}J_{j_i}\cup W\right)^c}\right]^2\right]-\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^{k}J_{j_i}\cup J_{n+1}\cup W\right)^c}\right]^2\right]$$
$$=\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^{k}J_{j_i}\cup W\right)^c}\right]-\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^{k}J_{j_i}\cup J_{n+1}\cup W\right)^c}\right]\right)^2\right].$$

Moreover, since $\mathbb{P}_{1/2}$ is the uniform measure, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^{k}J_{j_i}\cup J_{n+1}\cup W\right)^c}\right]=\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{J_{n+1}^c}\right]\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^{k}J_{j_i}\cup W\right)^c}\right].$$

Therefore:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n+1}(-1)^k\sum_{1\le j_1<\ldots<j_k\le n+1}\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^{k}J_{j_i}\cup W\right)^c}\right]^2\right]$$
$$=\sum_{k=0}^{n}(-1)^k\sum_{1\le j_1<\ldots<j_k\le n}\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h-\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{J_{n+1}^c}\right]\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\left(\cup_{i=1}^{k}J_{j_i}\cup W\right)^c}\right]^2\right].$$

By using (B.1) and the induction hypothesis for $h-\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h\,|\,J_{n+1}^c\right]$, we obtain that the above equals:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{Q}}_{h-\mathbb{E}_{1/2}[h|\mathcal{F}_{J_{n+1}^c}]}\left[\forall i\in\{1,\cdots,n\},S\cap J_i\neq\emptyset\,,\,S\cap W=\emptyset\right]$$
$$\le 4^n\left\|h-\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{J_{n+1}^c}\right]\right\|_\infty^2\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[JP_{J_1,\cdots,J_n}\left(h-\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{J_{n+1}^c}\right]\right)\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{W^c}\right]^2\right]$$
$$\le 4^{n+1}\parallel h\parallel_\infty^2\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[JP_{J_1,\cdots,J_n}\left(h-\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{J_{n+1}^c}\right]\right)\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{W^c}\right]^2\right].$$

The proof is over since:

$$JP_{J_1,\cdots,J_n}\left(h-\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[h\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{J_{n+1}^c}\right]\right)\subseteq JP_{J_1,\cdots,J_{n+1}}(h)\,.$$

□

C Appendix: the 4-arm event conditioned on a half-plane

Consider bond percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ or site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$.

Lemma C.1. *Let $r_2\ge r_1\ge 1$, let H be the lower half plane and let $\mathbb{H}=H\cap\mathcal{I}$. There exists an absolute constant $C<+\infty$ such that:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[\boldsymbol{A}_4(r_1,r_2)\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{H}}\right]^2\right]\le C\,\alpha_4(r_1,r_2)\left(\frac{r_2}{r_1}\right)^{-1/C},$$

where $\boldsymbol{A}_4(r_1,r_2)$ is the 4-arm event in the annulus $[-r_2,r_2]\setminus(-r_1,r_1)^2$. (Such an estimate is also true with the right, left or upper half-plane and the proof is the same.)

Proof. As pointed out in the beginning of Subsection 5.3 in [GPS10] for analogous events, it is not difficult to see that, if ω and ω' are two critical percolation configurations which coincide on $\mathbb{H}$ but are independent on $\mathbb{H}^c$, then:

$$\mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[\mathbf{A}_4(r_1,r_2)\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{H}}\right]^2\right]=\mathbb{P}\left[\omega,\omega'\in\mathbf{A}_4(r_1,r_2)\right].\tag{C.1}$$

Let $M \geq 100$ that we will choose later. First note that it is sufficient to prove the lemma for $r_1 < r_2$ of the form $\rho_l = M^l$ for some $l \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Let $1 \leq i < j$ be such that $r_1 = \rho_i = M^i$ and $r_2 = \rho_j = M^j$. Let $B(k) = B(k, M)$ be the event that there exist open paths in the annulus $[-\rho_{k+1}, \rho_{k+1}]^2 \setminus (-\rho_k, \rho_k)^2$ as in Figure 5. By FKG-inequality and RSW-estimate, there exists $c = c(M) > 0$ such that for all k we have $\mathbb{P}_{1/2}[B(k)] \geq c$. Given a realization of our variables ω and ω', we write $i \leq k_1 < \cdots < k_N \leq j-1$ the k's such that $B(k)$ is satisfied in ω (note that the random variables N and $(k_1, \cdots, k_N)$ are measurable with respect to ω and are independent of ω'). Note also that (by classical properties of the Binomial distribution and thanks to the existence of the above $c > 0$) there exists $a = a(M) \in (0,1)$ such that the probability of the event $\{N \leq a \log_M(r_2/r_1)\}$ is less than or equal to $\frac{1}{a}(1-a)^{\log_M(r_2/r_1)}$.

Note also that, if $\mathbf{A}_4(r_1, r_2) \cap B(k)$ is satisfied in some percolation configuration, then we have the 3-arm event in $[-(\rho_{k+1} - 3\rho_k/10), \rho_{k+1} - 3\rho_k/10]^2 \setminus (-(\rho_k + 3\rho_k/10), \rho_k + 3\rho_k/10)^2$ intersected with the lower half-plane $\mathbb{R} \times (-\infty, 2\rho_k/10]$ (see Figure 6). So, thanks to (2.6) we can say that there exists an absolute constant $C_0 < +\infty$ such that, for all $k \in \{1, \cdots, j-1\}$ we have:

$$\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[\mathbf{A}_4(\rho_k + 10, \rho_{k+1}) \,\middle|\, B(k)\right] \leq C_0\, M^{-2} \tag{C.2}$$

(technically, to obtain this estimate, we also need to condition on the upper open paths that cross the rectangle $[\rho_k + 2\rho_k/10, \rho_{k+1} - 2\rho_k/10] \times [\rho_k/10, 2\rho_k/10]$ and the rectangle $[-(\rho_k + 2\rho_k/10), -(\rho_{k+1} - 2\rho_k/10)] \times [\rho_k/10, 2\rho_k/10]$).



Figure 5: A realization of the event $B(k)$.

Now, we simply use that:

$$\{\omega, \omega' \in \mathbf{A}_4(r_1, r_2)\} \subseteq \{\omega \in \mathbf{A}_4(r_1, r_2)\} \cup \{\omega' \in \mathbf{A}_4(r_1, r_2)\},$$

and we choose to look only at ω in the annuli where $\omega \in B(k)$ and to look only at ω' in the other annuli. More precisely, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \leq l_1 < \cdots < l_m \leq j-1$, by spatial independence we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left[\omega,\, \omega' \in \mathbf{A}_4(r_1, r_2) \,\middle|\, N = m, k_1 = l_1, \cdots, k_m = l_m\right] \leq \mathbb{P}\left[\omega' \in \mathbf{A}_4(r_1, \rho_{l_1})\right] \\
&\times \prod_{q=1}^{m-1} \left(\mathbb{P}\left[\omega \in \mathbf{A}_4(\rho_{l_q} + 10, \rho_{l_q+1}) \,\middle|\, \omega \in B(l_q)\right] \mathbb{P}\left[\omega' \in \mathbf{A}_4(\rho_{l_q+1} + 10, \rho_{l_{q+1}})\right]\right) \\
&\times \mathbb{P}\left[\omega \in \mathbf{A}_4(\rho_{l_m} + 10, \rho_{l_m+1}) \,\middle|\, \omega \in B(l_m)\right] \mathbb{P}\left[\omega' \in \mathbf{A}_4(\rho_{l_m+1} + 10, r_2)\right].
\end{aligned}$$



Figure 6: A realization of the event $B(k)$ and of the 4-arm event implies the realization of a 3-arm event in a half-plane.

Next, (C.2) implies that the above is at most:

$$\alpha_4(r_1,\rho_{l_1}) \prod_{q=1}^{m-1} \left(\frac{C_0}{M^2}\, \alpha_4(\rho_{l_q+1}+10, \rho_{l_{q+1}}) \right) \frac{C_0}{M^2}\, \alpha_4(\rho_{l_m+1}+10, r_2)$$
$$= \alpha_4(r_1,\rho_{l_1}) \prod_{q=1}^{m-1} \left(\alpha_4(\rho_{l_q}, \rho_{l_q+1}+10)\, \alpha_4(\rho_{l_q+1}+10, \rho_{l_{q+1}})\, \frac{C_0}{M^2 \alpha_4(\rho_{l_q}, \rho_{l_q+1}+10)} \right)$$
$$\times\, \alpha_4(\rho_{l_m}, \rho_{l_m+1}+10)\, \alpha_4(\rho_{l_m+1}+10, r_2) \frac{C_0}{M^2 \alpha_4(\rho_{l_m}, \rho_{l_m+1}+10)}\,.$$

The quasi-multiplicativity property implies that there exists a constant $C_1 < +\infty$ such that the above is at most:

$$C_1\, \alpha_4(r_1,r_2) \prod_{q=1}^{m} \frac{C_1}{M^2 \alpha_4(\rho_{l_q}, \rho_{l_q+1})}\,. \tag{C.3}$$

Thanks to the left-hand-inequality of (2.7) we know that there exists some $\epsilon_2 > 0$ such that for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\alpha_4(\rho_l, \rho_{l+1}) \geq \frac{1}{\epsilon_2} M^{-2+\epsilon_2}\,.$$

We deduce that we can choose $100 \leq M < +\infty$ such that for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\frac{C_1}{M^2 \alpha_4(\rho_l, \rho_{l+1})} \leq 1/2\,. \tag{C.4}$$

We fix such an M. Then, (C.3) and (C.4) imply that:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\omega, \omega' \in \mathbf{A}_4(r_1,r_2) \,\middle|\, N = m, k_1 = l_1, \cdots, k_m = l_m \right] \leq C_1 \alpha_4(r_1,r_2)/2^m\,. \tag{C.5}$$

Now, we write:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\omega, \omega' \in \mathbf{A}_4(r_1,r_2)\right] \leq \mathbb{P}\left[N \leq a \log_M(r_2/r_1)\,,\, \omega' \in \mathbf{A}_4(r_1,r_2)\right]$$
$$+ \mathbb{P}\left[N \geq a \log_M(r_2/r_1)\,,\, \omega, \omega' \in \mathbf{A}_4(r_1,r_2)\right]\,, \tag{C.6}$$

where the constant $a = a(M)$ comes from the beginning of the proof.

By independence of ω and ω' on $\mathbb{H}^c$ we can say that the first term of the right-hand-side of (C.6) equals:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left[N \leq a \log_M(r_2/r_1)\right] \mathbb{P}\left[\omega' \in \mathbf{A}_4(r_1, r_2)\right] &\leq \frac{1}{a}(1-a)^{\log_M(r_2/r_1)}\, \alpha_4(r_1, r_2) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{2}\left(\frac{r_2}{r_1}\right)^{-1/C} \alpha_4(r_1, r_2)\,,\end{aligned}$$

for some $C < +\infty$.

Thanks to (C.5) we know that the second term of the right-hand-side of (C.6) is also less than or equal to $\frac{C}{2}\left(\frac{r_2}{r_1}\right)^{-1/C} \alpha_4(r_1, r_2)$ if C is sufficiently large. And the proof is over thanks to (C.1). □

Lemma C.2. *For site percolation on $\mathbb{T}$, there exists $\zeta_4^{|\mathbb{H}} \in (5/4, 5/2]$ such that:*

$$\beta_4^{|\mathbb{H}}(r_1, r_2) := \mathbb{E}_{1/2}\left[\mathbb{P}_{1/2}\left[\boldsymbol{A}_4(r_1, r_2) \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{H}}\right]^2\right] = \left(\frac{r_1}{r_2}\right)^{\zeta_4^{|\mathbb{H}}+o(1)},$$

where $r_2 \geq r_1 \geq 1$ and $o(1) \to 0$ as $r_1/r_2 \to 0$.

Proof. We shall only sketch the proof here. To prove that this exponent exists on $\mathbb{T}$ (without necessarily computing its value), one proceeds as with classical exponents which describe critical percolation in two steps (see [LSW02, SW01, Wer07]):

1. First, one needs to show that for any fixed $r < R$, the quantity $\beta_4^{|\mathbb{H}}(\lambda r, \lambda R)$ converges as $\lambda \to +\infty$ to a limiting real number which is expressible in terms of the continuum scaling limit of percolation. For usual *arm-exponents*, these limiting numbers are given by SLE_6 computable quantities. In the present case, these limiting real numbers are instead described in terms of the continuum scaling limit of percolation introduced by Schramm-Smirnov [SS11]. The proof follows very similar lines as the proof of Theorem 10.1 in [GPS10]. Let us be a little more precise here: In order to prove Theorem 10.1 in [GPS10], two results are used: *(a)* the existence and uniqueness of the continuum scaling limit of percolation (see Subsection 2.3 of [GPS13a] for the uniqueness part) and *(b)* a "mesh independent gluing property for crossing of quads" which is Proposition 10.3 of [GPS10] and Proposition 4.1 of [SS11]. The only difference in our case is that we need a gluing property for the 4-arm event instead of the crossing of quads. Such a result easily follows from the gluing properties for crossing of quads and from results about the scaling limit of arm event in Subsection 2.4 of [GPS13a] (see in particular (2.3) in this last paper).
2. Then one needs to prove that the quantity $\beta_4^{|\mathbb{H}}(r_1, r_2)$ statisfies a **quasi-multiplicativity property** (see [Wer07]). This is Proposition 5.1 of [GPS10] (with $W = \mathbb{H}^c$).

Once $\zeta_4^{|\mathbb{H}}$ is proved to exist, the fact that it belongs to $(5/4, 5/2]$ follows directly from Lemma C.1 and the computation of the critical exponents. □

References

[BGS13] Erik I Broman, Christophe Garban, and Jeffrey E. Steif. Exclusion sensitivity of Boolean functions. *Probability theory and related fields*, 155(3-4):621–663, 2013.

[BKS99] Itai Benjamini, Gil Kalai, and Oded Schramm. Noise sensitivity of Boolean functions and applications to percolation. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (90):5–43 (2001), 1999.

[BR06] Béla Bollobás and Oliver Riordan. *Percolation*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2006.

[FvdH15] Robert Fitzner and Remco van der Hofstad. Mean-field behavior for nearest-neighbour percolation in $d > 10$. *Preprint*, 2015.

[For15a] Malin Palö Forsström. A Noise Sensitivity Theorem for Schreier Graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.01828*, 2015.

[For15b] Malin Palö Forsström. Monotonicity properties of exclusion sensitivity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.05735*, 2015.

[GPS10] Christophe Garban, Gábor Pete, and Oded Schramm. The Fourier spectrum of critical percolation. *Acta Mathematica*, 205(1):19–104, 2010.

[GPS13a] Christophe Garban, Gábor Pete, and Oded Schramm. Pivotal, cluster, and interface measures for critical planar percolation. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 26(4):939–1024, 2013.

[GPS13b] Christophe Garban, Gábor Pete, and Oded Schramm. The scaling limits of near-critical and dynamical percolation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1305.5526*, 2013.

[Gri99] Geoffrey R. Grimmett. *Percolation (Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften)*. Springer: Berlin, Germany, 1999.

[GS14] Christophe Garban and Jeffrey Steif. *Noise sensitivity of Boolean functions and percolation*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.

[Har60] Theodore E. Harris. A lower bound for the critical probability in a certain percolation process. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 56(01):13–20, 1960.

[Har78] Theodore E. Harris. Additive set-valued Markov processes and graphical methods. *Ann. Probability.* 6, no. 3, 355–378, 1978.

[HPS97] Olle Häggström, Yuval Peres, and Jeffrey E. Steif. Dynamical percolation. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 33(4):497–528, 1997.

[HPS15] Alan Hammond, Gábor Pete, and Oded Schramm. Local time on the exceptional set of dynamical percolation and the incipient infinite cluster. *Ann. Probab.*, 43 (6):2949–3005, 2015.

[HS94] Takashi Hara and Gordon Slade. Mean-field behaviour and the lace expansion. In *Probability and phase transition (Cambridge, 1993)*, volume 420 of *NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci.*, 87–122. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1994.

[Kes80] Harry Kesten. The critical probability of bond percolation on the square lattice equals 1/2. *Comm. Math. Phys. 74, no. 1*, 1980.

[Kes87] Harry Kesten. Scaling relations for 2d-percolation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 109(1):109–156, 1987.

[KZ87] Harry Kesten and Yu Zhang. Strict inequalities for some critical exponents in two-dimensional percolation. *Journal of statistical physics*, 46(5-6):1031–1055, 1987.

[Lig05] Thomas M. Liggett. *Interacting particle systems*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005. Reprint of the 1985 original.

[LSW02] Gregory F. Lawler, Oded Schramm, and Wendelin Werner. One-arm exponent for critical 2D percolation. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 7:no. 2, 13 pp. (electronic), 2002.

[Nol08] Pierre Nolin. Near-critical percolation in two dimensions. *Electron. J. Probab*, 13(55):1562–1623, 2008.

[PS98] Yuval Peres and Jeffrey E. Steif. The number of infinite clusters in dynamical percolation. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 111, pp 141–165, 1998

[Smi01] Stanislav Smirnov. Critical percolation in the plane: Conformal invariance, Cardy's formula, scaling limits. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences-Series I-Mathematics*, 333(3):239–244, 2001.

[SS10] Oded Schramm and Jeffrey E. Steif. Quantitative noise sensitivity and exceptional times for percolation. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 171(2):619–672, 2010.

[SS11] Oded Schramm and Stanislav Smirnov. On the scaling limits of planar percolation. With an appendix by Christophe Garban. *Ann. Probab.* 39, no. 5, 1768–1814, 2011.

[SW01] Stanislav Smirnov and Wendelin Werner. Critical exponents for two-dimensional percolation. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 8(5-6):729–744, 2001.

[Wer07] Wendelin Werner. Lectures on two-dimensional critical percolation. *IAS Park City Graduate Summer School*, 2007.

Christophe Garban
Université Lyon 1
http://math.univ-lyon1.fr/~garban/
Supported by the ANR grant "Liouville" ANR-15-CE40-0013

Hugo Vanneuville
Université Lyon 1
http://math.univ-lyon1.fr/~vanneuville/
Supported by the ANR grant "Liouville" ANR-15-CE40-0013